arXiv:1411.6471v3 [math.ST] 7 Oct 2015

Optimal string clustering based on a Laplace-like mixture and EM algorithm on a set of strings

Hitoshi Koyano,[1*] Morihiro Hayashida,[2] and Tatsuya Akutsu[2]

[1]Laboratory of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics,

Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University,

54 Kawahara-cho, Shogoin, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8507, Japan

[2]Laboratory of Mathematical Bioinformatics,

Institute for Chemical Research, Kyoto University,

Gokasho, Uji, Kyoto 611-0011, Japan

[*]Corresponding author. E-mail: koyano@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

In this study, we address the problem of clustering string data in an unsupervised manner by developing a theory of a mixture model and an EM algorithm for string data based on probability theory on a topological monoid of strings developed in our previous studies. We first construct a parametric distribution on a set of strings in the motif of the Laplace distribution on a set of real numbers and reveal its basic properties. This Laplace-like distribution has two parameters: a string that represents the location of the distribution and a positive real number that represents the dispersion. It is difficult to explicitly write maximum likelihood estimators of the parameters because their log likelihood function is a complex function, the variables

of which include a string; however, we construct estimators that almost surely converge to the maximum likelihood estimators as the number of observed strings increases and demonstrate that the estimators strongly consistently estimate the parameters. Next, we develop an iteration algorithm for estimating the parameters of the mixture model of the Laplace-like distributions and demonstrate that the algorithm almost surely converges to the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture and strongly consistently estimates its parameters as the numbers of observed strings and iterations increase. Finally, we derive a procedure for unsupervised string clustering from the Laplace-like mixture that is asymptotically optimal in the sense that the posterior probability of making correct classifications is maximized.

Keywords: Unsupervised string clustering, probability theory on a topological monoid of strings, statistical asymptotics, Laplace-like mixture, EM algorithm.

1 Introduction

Numbers and numerical vectors account for a large portion of data. However, the amount of string data generated has increased dramatically in recent years. For example, large amounts of text data have been produced on the Web. In the life sciences, large amounts of data regarding genes, RNAs, and proteins have been generated. These data are nucleotide or amino acid sequences and are represented as strings. Consequently, methods for analyzing string data are required in many fields, including computer science and the life sciences. Many studies have been conducted, especially on classification and clustering methods for analyzing string data. At present, a procedure of converting the strings into numerical vectors using string kernels [12, 23–25, 27, 28, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 51] and subsequently applying a support vector machine that works in a numerical vector space (see, for example, [1, 3, 5, 10, 44]) to the vectors is frequently used to classify strings. A widely used approach to clustering strings is calculating a distance matrix for the strings and then applying the k-means or nearest neighbor method to the matrix.

However, the conversion using string kernels is not one-to-one and thus entails a loss of infor-

mation. Furthermore, in analyzing string data, it is not necessarily natural to convert the strings into numerical vectors because, as described in detail in Subsections A1 and A2 of the Appendix, a set of strings and a numerical vector space are completely different in the mathematical structure and the structures of a numerical vector space that a set of strings does not have are implicitly used in analyzing the converted data. Thus, it is natural that the observed elements of a set of strings, i.e., string data, be analyzed as elements of a set of strings instead of as elements of a numerical vector space. The most serious problem common to existing methods for analyzing string data is that their performance has never been evaluated using probability theory in a theoretical manner, considering that a given string data set is part of a population generated according to a probability law. The performance of the methods has been generally evaluated in a numerical manner in which they are applied to certain data sets and cross-validation is repeated. However, the results of performance evaluations conducted in this manner frequently vary greatly depending on the data sets used.

Statistical methods for numerical data were rigorously constructed based on probability theory on a set of real numbers and a numerical vector space to make it possible to analyze data, considering that we make an inference of a population based on a part of it observed according to a probability law. Similarly, statistical methods for string data should also be constructed based on probability theory on a set of strings. In this study, we address the problem of clustering string data in an unsupervised manner by applying probability theory on a set of strings developed in [19–21]. Our approach to unsupervised string clustering in this study is based on a mixture model of distributions on a set of strings. We put special emphasis on evaluating the performance of a proposed method using probability theory in a theoretical manner, not repeating cross-validation in a numerical manner.

Introducing a parametric probability distribution to be used as components of a mixture model on a set of strings and constructing an EM algorithm [8, 31] for the mixture model [32, 40] are critical components of the aforementioned approach. No parametric distributions have been in-

troduced on a set of strings other than an analogy of the Poisson distribution and its extension, introduced in [20]. Therefore, we first introduce an analogy of the Laplace distribution on a set of strings that has two parameters, a string that represents the location of the distribution and a positive real number that represents the dispersion in Section 2. This Laplace-like distribution on a set of strings is designed to represent the distributions of orthologous genes. Its basic properties are examined in detail in Subsection A2. In this preliminary study, we also reconsider the conventional definition of a median string and assert that it is not valid under all distance functions on a set of strings because various distance functions are defined on a set of strings (see the second paragraph of the next section) and each provides the set with a complex metric structure that is completely different, for example, from a numerical vector space. Next, we consider the problem of estimating the parameters of the Laplace-like distribution in Section 3. It is difficult to explicitly write a maximum likelihood estimator of the location parameter, and thus of the dispersion parameter, using analytic expressions or algorithms because the maximum likelihood estimation problem is a maximization problem of a complex function whose arguments include a string. We construct estimators that almost surely converge to the maximum likelihood estimators as the number of observed strings increases and demonstrate that the estimators strongly consistently estimate the parameters. Next, we develop an iteration algorithm for estimating the parameters of the mixture model of the Laplace-like distributions on a set of strings in Section 4. Although the EM algorithm cannot be explicitly written in this estimation problem, we demonstrate that the composed algorithm almost surely converges to the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture and strongly consistently estimates its parameters as the numbers of observed strings and iterations increase, choosing an initial value that satisfies a given condition. Finally, in Section 5, we derive a procedure for clustering strings in an unsupervised manner from the Laplace-like mixture and describe that it is asymptotically optimal in the sense that the posterior probability of making correct classifications is maximized. A summary of probability theory on a set of strings that was developed in [19–21] and is used in this paper is provided in Subsection A1. In Subsection A4, we show

that a result on the strong consistency of maximum likelihood estimators in the case where the parameter space is the set of real numbers (see, for example, [41, 47]) can be extended to the case where the parameter space is the direct product of the sets of strings and real numbers. The result on the strong consistency in this case is applied to demonstrate Theorems 1 and 2 in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Proofs of all results are provided in Subsection A6.

2 Laplace-like distribution on a set of strings

Let $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{z-1}\}$ be an alphabet composed of $z-1$ letters. We set $a_z = e$ for an empty letter e and refer to $\overline{A} = \{a_1, \cdots, a_z\} = A \cup \{e\}$ as an extended alphabet. In this study, we define a string on A as a finite sequence of elements of A to the end of which an infinite sequence $o = e\cdots$ of empty letters is appended. Defining a string in this manner, a random string is naturally defined in a manner in which it can realize strings of varying lengths (see the third and fourth paragraphs of Subsection A1). We denote the set of all strings on A by A^*. Our objects in this study are sequences of random variables that take values in A^* (random strings), their distributions, and their realizations, i.e., string data. In the following sections, we use a fundamental framework of a probability theory on A^* that was proposed in [20] and extended in [19, 21]. A summary of this theory is provided in Subsection A1. See also the supplemental material of [20] for details on the theory of random strings.

In this study, we consider distance functions that take values in $\mathbb{N}$ (the set of natural numbers including zero) as distance functions on A^* and denote a set of them by D. D includes the longest common subsequence distance (see, for example, [2]), the Levenshtein distance [26] (denoted by d_L), and the Damerau–Levenshtein distance [6]. See, for example, [33] for a review of the distances on A^* (the Jaro–Winkler distance [13, 50] is not a distance on A^* in a mathematical sense because it does not obey the triangle inequality). In this paper, we regard the deletion of consecutive letters at the end of a string as the substitution of them into empty letters and the insertion of letters to the end of a string as the substitution of empty letters appended to the end of the string into

the letters. We refer to the minimum number of substitutions in this sense required to transform one string into another as the extended Hamming distance and denote it by $d_{H'}$. The ordinary Hamming distance [11] (denoted by d_H) is not a mathematical distance on A^* because it is defined only between strings with equal lengths, but $d_{H'}$ is a mathematical distance on A^*. $d_{H'}$ is regarded as the distance on A^* in which the fewest types of edit operation are allowed. The analysis of biological sequences is started from multiple alignment (see, for example, [48]) in many cases. It is reasonable that the distance between multiple aligned sequences is measured in terms of $d_{H'}$ and, therefore, $d_{H'}$ is of special importance in biological sequence analysis. If, for example, d_L is used as a distance function on A^*, we write $d = d_L$.

We set $U_d(s,r) = \{t \in A^* : d(s,t) \leq r\}$ and $\partial U_d(s,r) = \{t \in A^* : d(s,t) = r\}$ for $s \in A^*$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and $d \in D$. We denote the number of elements of a set S by $|S|$ and the power set of S by 2^S. The length of $s \in A^*$ is the number of elements of A that compose s and is represented by $|s|$ (see the third paragraph of Subsection A1). We begin with introducing a parametric probability distribution on A^*.

Proposition and definition 1 We define the function $q_d(\,\cdot\,;\lambda,\rho) : A^* \to [0,1]$ as

$$q_d(s;\lambda,\rho) = \frac{1}{(\rho+1)\left|\partial U_d(\lambda, d(s,\lambda))\right|}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)^{d(s,\lambda)} \tag{1}$$

for any $\lambda \in A^*$, $\rho \in (0,\infty)$, and $d \in D$. Then, $q_d(\,\cdot\,;\lambda,\rho)$ is a probability function on A^*. Thus, we define the set function $Q_d(\,\cdot\,;\lambda,\rho) : 2^{A^*} \to [0,1]$ as

$$Q_d(E;\lambda,\rho) = \sum_{s\in E} q_d(s;\lambda,\rho)$$

and refer to $Q_d(\,\cdot\,;\lambda,\rho)$ as a Laplace-like distribution on A^* with parameters λ and ρ (denoted by $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$).

We refer to a string that a random string σ generates with the highest probability as a mode string of σ and denote it by $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma)$. After reconsidering a conventional definition of a median string of n strings, we introduce a median string $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)$ of σ in Subsection A2. We also use a consensus sequence $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ of $\sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$, a sequence of letters to which a marginal distribution

of α_j assigns the highest probability for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, as a measure of the location of a distribution on A^* in addition to $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma)$ and $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)$ and use mean absolute deviations around $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma), \boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)$, and $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ as measures of the dispersion ($\mathbb{Z}^+$ represents the set of positive integers). Their definitions are provided in Subsection A1. Although the symbol $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ is used in Subsection A1 only if a consensus sequence of σ is unique, in the other sections, $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ represents one of the consensus sequences if it is not unique.

As shown in Subsection A2 and Section 3, the Laplace-like distribution on A^* has properties similar to those of the Laplace distribution [18, 22] on $\mathbb{R}$ (the set of real numbers) in the following respects. (i) It has two parameters, λ and ρ, that represent the location and dispersion of the distribution, respectively. (ii) Its probability function $q_d(s; \lambda, \rho)$ monotonically decreases as $d(s, \lambda)$ becomes larger (therefore, it is unimodal at λ) and assigns an equal probability to strings with equal distances to λ (therefore, it is symmetric with respect to λ). (iii) $q_d(s; \lambda, \rho)$ decreases exponentially as $d(s, \lambda)$ becomes larger and does not have inflection points, in contrast to the normal distribution on $\mathbb{R}$. (iv) If a random string σ is distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$, we have $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma) = \lambda$ for any $d \in D$. In contrast to the Laplace distribution on $\mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \lambda$ generally does not hold, but if $d = d_{H'}$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $t \in A^*$ satisfying $|t| = \ell$, we have $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma) \cdot t$, where $\cdot$ represents the concatenation (see Subsection A1 for the definition). (v) Furthermore, the mean absolute deviation of σ around λ is equal to ρ for any $d \in D$. (vi) It has the maximum entropy among all distributions on A^* that satisfy the condition that the mean absolute deviation around some fixed string is equal to a given positive real number. (vii) If $d = d_{H'}$, the maximum likelihood estimators of parameters λ and ρ are asymptotically equal to a truncated consensus sequence (introduced in the next section) and a mean absolute deviation around it, respectively. In the following sections, we drop d from U_d, ∂U_d, q_d, and Q_d.

3 Estimation of the parameters of the Laplace-like distribution on A^*

In this section, we consider the problem of estimating the location and dispersion parameters $\lambda \in A^*$ and $\rho \in (0,\infty)$ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$. We suppose that observed strings $s_1,\cdots,s_n \in A^*$ are given. We denote the relative frequency of a_h at the j-th site of $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ by f_{jh} for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $h \in \{1,\cdots,z\}$ and set

$$j^* = \min\left\{ j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : f_{jz} = \max_{1\leq h\leq z} f_{jh} \right\} - 1. \tag{2}$$

j^* is the number of the last site at which it is guaranteed that a letter that has a maximum relative frequency is nonempty for $s_1,\cdots,s_n$. If $j^* \geq 1$, we introduce the following condition $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ for $\epsilon > 0$.

$\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$: There exists $j \in \{1,\cdots,j^*\}$ such that for any $j' \in \{j,\cdots,j^*\}$,

$$\max_{1\leq h\leq z-1} f_{j'h} - \min_{1\leq h\leq z-1} f_{j'h} < \epsilon$$

holds. If ϵ is sufficiently small, this inequality means that the relative frequencies of all nonempty letters are almost uniform at the j'-th site. $\neg\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ represents the negation of $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$. If $\{j \in \{1,\cdots,j^*\} : \mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)} \text{ holds}\} \neq \emptyset$, we set

$$j^{(\epsilon)} = \min\left\{ j \in \{1,\cdots,j^*\} : \mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)} \text{ holds} \right\} - 1. \tag{3}$$

We put $\eta(j) = \arg\max_{1\leq h\leq z} f_{jh}$. If the maximizer of the right-hand side is not unique, we set $\eta(j)$ as an arbitrary one of them. We define an estimator $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ of λ (referred to as a truncated consensus sequence of $s_1,\cdots,s_n$) as

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) = \begin{cases} o & \text{if } [j^* = 0] \vee [j^* \geq 1 \wedge \mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)} \wedge j^{(\epsilon)} = 0], \\ a_{\eta(1)}\cdots a_{\eta(j^*)}e\cdots & \text{if } j^* \geq 1 \wedge \neg\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}, \\ a_{\eta(1)}\cdots a_{\eta(j^{(\epsilon)})}e\cdots & \text{if } j^* \geq 1 \wedge \mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)} \wedge j^{(\epsilon)} \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $\wedge$ and $\vee$ represent conjunction and disjunction, respectively. Noting Proposition 6 in Subsection A2, if $d = d_{H'}$, $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ becomes a reasonable estimator of λ as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. As described in Proposition 7 in Subsection A2, parameter ρ is equal to the mean absolute deviation around λ

for any $d \in D$, and it is therefore reasonable to estimate ρ by $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i, \lambda)/n$ for any $d \in D$ if λ is known. If λ is unknown, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n))/n$ is a reasonable estimator of ρ for $d = d_{H'}$. In this section, we describe results in regard to the accuracy of these estimators and their relation with the maximum likelihood estimators of λ and ρ.

Let $\{\sigma_i = \{\alpha_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$. We set

$$p(i, j, h) = P(\{\omega \in \Omega : \alpha_{ij}(\omega) = a_h\}), \quad \bar{p}(j, h, n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(i, j, h)$$

for each $h = 1, \cdots, z$. $p(i, j, h)$ represents the probability that the j-th letter of the i-th random string realizes the h-th letter in the extended alphabet $\bar{A}$, and $\bar{p}(j, h, n)$ represents the average probability that the h-th letter in $\bar{A}$ is observed when n observations are made. The definitions of $\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*), [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)], [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ are provided in Subsection A1. Let S a.s. for any statement S and $\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}$ represent that S holds with probability one and the almost sure convergence, respectively. First, we demonstrate the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *We suppose that (i) $d = d_{H'}$ and that (ii) there exist $m = \{m_1, \cdots, m_{|m|}, e, \cdots\} \in A^*$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $t \in A^*$ satisfying $|t| = \ell$, a consensus sequence of a distribution on A^* is represented by $m \cdot t$. Let $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ be realizations of random strings $\sigma_1 = \{\alpha_{1j} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}, \cdots, \sigma_n = \{\alpha_{nj} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. If (iii) $\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{nj}$ are independent for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and (iv) there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_0$, then $(\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n) \in [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]_{|m|}$ a.s. holds, $\iota(j) = \arg\max_{1 \leq h \leq z-1} \bar{p}(j, h, n)$ is uniquely determined independently of n for each $j = 1, \cdots, |m|$, and $\{a_{\iota(1)}, \cdots, a_{\iota(|m|)}\} = \{m_1, \cdots, m_{|m|}\}$ holds, then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n \geq N_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = m \quad \text{a.s.}$$

If $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ are independent, then $\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{nj}$ are also independent for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, but the converse is not true. In Lemma 1, the independence of $\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{nj}$ is supposed for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ (condition (iii)), but the independence of $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ is not. Furthermore, in Lemma 1, it is not supposed that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ have an identical distribution on A^* a consensus sequence of which is represented by $m \cdot t$. If $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ have a distribution that is unimodal at m and symmetric about

m, conditions (ii) and (iv) are satisfied. Condition (ii) can hold even if $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ have different distributions if they are unimodal at *m* and symmetric about *m* (see Lemma 3 in Subsection A2). More importantly, for condition (iv) to hold, it is not necessary that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ have the identical mode string *m* as well as that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ have distributions unimodal at *m* and symmetric about *m*.

From Lemma 1, we immediately obtain the following result with respect to the strongly consistent estimation of parameter λ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$.

Proposition 1 *We consider the problem of estimating parameter λ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$ with $d = d_{H'}$ based on realizations $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ of random strings $\sigma_1 = \{\alpha_{1j} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}, \cdots, \sigma_n = \{\alpha_{nj} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. If conditions (iii) and (iv) of Lemma 1, in which m is replaced with λ, are satisfied, there exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n \geq N_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \lambda \quad \text{a.s.},$$

i.e., $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ strongly consistently estimates λ for sufficiently small ϵ.

Proposition 1 holds when ρ is known or unknown.

Proposition 2 *We consider the problem of estimating parameter ρ based on realizations $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ of random strings $\sigma_1 = \{\alpha_{1j} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}, \cdots, \sigma_n = \{\alpha_{nj} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ (i) that are distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$. (a) If λ is known, (ii) $d \in D$ is arbitrary, and (iii) $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ are independent, we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho$$

as $n \longrightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, (b) if λ is unknown, (ii′) $d = d_{H'}$, (iii′) $\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{nj}$ are independent for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho$$

as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.

Therefore, we obtained the strong consistent estimators of λ and ρ. Are these the maximum likelihood estimators? We first describe the relation between $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i, \lambda)/n$ and the maximum likelihood estimator of ρ.

Proposition 3 *For any $d \in D$, the maximum likelihood estimator of parameter ρ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ is given by*

$$\check{\rho}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda)$$

if another parameter λ is known. If λ is unknown, the maximum likelihood estimator of ρ is obtained by replacing λ on the right-hand side of the above equation with its maximum likelihood estimator.

Next, we consider the maximum likelihood estimation of λ. Noting that $|\partial U(\lambda, d(s_i,\lambda))| \geq 1$ and $\rho/(\rho+1) < 1$, we need to find λ that maximizes

$$F(\lambda,\rho) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left|\partial U(\lambda, d(s_i,\lambda))\right| + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda), \tag{5}$$

given ρ. The function $F(\lambda,\rho)$ that determines an estimate of λ depends on ρ, whereas the estimator of ρ depends on λ from Proposition 3. Furthermore, seeking a formula for the size of a sphere of strings is an open problem. Therefore, it is difficult to solve the maximization problem with respect to λ, considering both terms of the right-hand side of Equation (5) simultaneously. However, in the case of $d = d_L$, several approximation algorithms for seeking a minimizer of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_L(s_i,\lambda)$ have been proposed. Thus, in this case, it would be natural to seek an approximate solution of the maximization problem of Equation (5) according to a procedure provided in Subsection A3.

In the case of $d = d_{H'}$, there exists an interesting relation between $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ and the maximum likelihood estimator of λ. In this case, given a sufficiently large number of observed strings, we can explicitly write the maximum likelihood estimators $\check{\lambda}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ and $\check{\rho}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ of parameters λ and ρ.

Theorem 1 *We consider the problem of estimating parameters λ and ρ based on realizations $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ of random strings $\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n$ that are (i) independent and (ii) distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ (iii) with $d = d_{H'}$. There exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$ such that if $n \geq N_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{\lambda}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) &= \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) \quad \text{a.s.,} \\
\check{\rho}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)) \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned}$$

4 Estimation algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^*

Let $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ be n observed strings from a population distributed according to the mixture model

$$q(s;\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{g=1}^{k} \pi_g q(s;\lambda_g,\rho_g)$$

of k Laplace-like distributions on A^* with the unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_k, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k, \rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k)$. The parameter space of this model is $\Theta = (0,1)^k \times (A^*)^k \times (0,\infty)^k$. In this section, we develop an iteration algorithm for estimating $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ based on $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ and then investigate its accuracy and relation with the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^*.

4.1 General form of the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^*

We denote the i-th observed string by $s_i = \{x_{ij} \in \bar{A} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$. We suppose that s_i is a realization of a random string σ_i. For each $g = 1, \cdots, k$, we define a k-dimensional real vector $\boldsymbol{w}_g = (w_{g1}, \cdots, w_{gk})$ by $w_{gg} = 1$ and $w_{gg'} = 0$ for $g' \neq g$, and we set $W = \{\boldsymbol{w}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{w}_k\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{Z}_i = (Z_{i1}, \cdots, Z_{ik})$ be a k-dimensional latent random vector that takes values in W. We define the probability function of the distribution of $\boldsymbol{Z}_i$ as

$$P(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{w}_g) = \prod_{g'=1}^{k} \pi_{g'}^{w_{gg'}}. \tag{6}$$

Because $P(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{w}_g) = \pi_g$ holds, $\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{w}_g$ and $P(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{w}_g)$ are interpreted to represent the event that the i-th string is collected from the g-th subpopulation and the probability that this event occurs, respectively. The probability function of the conditional distribution of $\boldsymbol{Z}_i$ given $\sigma_1(\omega) = s_1, \cdots, \sigma_n(\omega) = s_n$ is calculated as

$$P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{w}_g | \sigma_1(\omega) = s_1, \cdots, \sigma_n(\omega) = s_n) = \frac{\pi_g q(s_i|\lambda_g,\rho_g)}{\sum_{g'=1}^{k} \pi_{g'} q(s_i|\lambda_{g'},\rho_{g'})}.$$

We set

$$\zeta_{ig} = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[Z_{ig} | \sigma_1(\omega) = s_1, \cdots, \sigma_n(\omega) = s_n], \quad \hat{\zeta}_{ig} = \mathrm{E}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[Z_{ig} | \sigma_1(\omega) = s_1, \cdots, \sigma_n(\omega) = s_n] \tag{7}$$

for some estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. For each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, we introduce a k-dimensional real vector $\boldsymbol{z}_i = (z_{i1}, \cdots, z_{ik})$ defined by

$$z_{ig} = 1 \text{ and } z_{ig'} = 0 \text{ for } g' \neq g \Longleftrightarrow s_i \text{ was collected from the } g\text{-th subpopulation.}$$

$\boldsymbol{z}_i$ is an unknown constant vector that is defined after the i-th string was observed. We suppose that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{Z}_n$ are independent. We first demonstrate the following lemma that holds for any $d \in D$:

Lemma 2 *For any $d \in D$, the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^* has the following form.*

1 *Choose arbitrary initial values $\hat{\pi}_g^{(0)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(0)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(0)}$ of the parameters for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$.*

2 *For $t = 1, 2, \cdots$,*

2.1 *Compute*

$$\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_g^{(t-1)} q(s_i | \hat{\lambda}_g^{(t-1)}, \hat{\rho}_g^{(t-1)})}{\sum_{g'=1}^{k} \hat{\pi}_{g'}^{(t-1)} q(s_i | \hat{\lambda}_{g'}^{(t-1)}, \hat{\rho}_{g'}^{(t-1)})} \tag{8}$$

for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $g = 1, \cdots, k$.

2.2 *Compute*

$$\hat{\pi}_g^{(t)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}, \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t)} = \arg\max_{\lambda_g \in A^*} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} \left\{ -\log \left| \partial U(\lambda_g, d(s_i, \lambda_g)) \right| + d(s_i, \lambda_g) \log \left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(t-1)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(t-1)} + 1} \right) \right\}, \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{\rho}_g^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} d(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(t)}) \tag{11}$$

for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$.

2.3 *If $\hat{\pi}_g^{(t)}$, $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(t)}$ are sufficiently close to $\hat{\pi}_g^{(t-1)}$, $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t-1)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(t-1)}$, respectively, for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$, terminate the iteration and return $\hat{\pi}_g^{(t)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(t)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(t)}$. Otherwise, increment t by one and return to Step 2.1.*

In the case of $d = d_L$, it would be a natural method of updating $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t)}$ in Step 2.2 using the procedure described in Subsection A3.

4.2 Estimation algorithm under the extended Hamming distance

In this subsection, we investigate the algorithm of Lemma 2 in the case of $d = d_{H'}$ in detail. We prespecify $\epsilon > 0$. We put

$$f_{gjh} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig}} \sum_{i \in \{i' \in \{1,\cdots,n\} : x_{i'j} = a_h\}} z_{ig}, \quad \varphi_{gjh} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}} \sum_{i \in \{i' \in \{1,\cdots,n\} : x_{i'j} = a_h\}} \hat{\zeta}_{ig} \tag{12}$$

for each $g = 1,\cdots,k$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $h = 1,\cdots,z$. f_{gjh} is the relative frequency of a_h at the j-th site of strings collected from the g-th subpopulation, and φ_{gjh} is an estimator of the probability that the j-th letter of a string from the g-th subpopulation is equal to a_h. We set j_g^* and $\eta(g,j)$ by replacing f_{jh} in Equation (2) and in the definition of $\eta(j)$, respectively, with φ_{gjh}. Let $\mathrm{U}_g^{(\epsilon)}$ be the condition obtained by replacing j^* and f_{jh} in the condition $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ with j_g^* and φ_{gjh}, respectively. $j_g^{(\epsilon)}$ is defined by replacing j^* and $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ in Equation (3) with j_g^* and $\mathrm{U}_g^{(\epsilon)}$, respectively. We introduce an estimator $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(\epsilon)}$ of λ_g as

$$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(\epsilon)} = \hat{\lambda}_g^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n) = \begin{cases} o & \text{if } [j_g^* = 0] \vee [j_g^* \geq 1 \wedge \mathrm{U}_g^{(\epsilon)} \wedge j_g^{(\epsilon)} = 0], \\ a_{\eta(g,1)} \cdots a_{\eta(g,j_g^*)} e \cdots & \text{if } j_g^* \geq 1 \wedge \neg \mathrm{U}_g^{(\epsilon)}, \\ a_{\eta(g,1)} \cdots a_{\eta(g,j_g^{(\epsilon)})} e \cdots & \text{if } j_g^* \geq 1 \wedge \mathrm{U}_g^{(\epsilon)} \wedge j_g^{(\epsilon)} \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(\epsilon)}$ is regarded as a probabilistic extension of the truncated consensus sequence $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)$ provided by Equation (4) to the case where it is unknown from which subpopulation each observation was collected. We denote $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(\epsilon)}$ obtained by replacing $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}$ in Equation (12) with $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}$ by $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t,\epsilon)}$. We abbreviate the algorithm of Lemma 2 that uses $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(t,\epsilon)}$ as an estimate of λ_g at iteration step t as Algorithm H'. We investigate the asymptotic property of Algorithm H' in the following. Because we develop an asymptotic theory with respect to n and t, we denote estimates of $\zeta_{ig}, \pi_g, \lambda_g$, and ρ_g from Algorithm H' by $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$, respectively. Let n_g be the number of strings collected from the g-th subpopulation, and set $n^* = \min\{n_1,\cdots,n_k\}$. We denote strings from the g-th subpopulation among observed strings $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ by $s_{g1},\cdots,s_{gn_g}$ and a random string that generates s_{gi} by σ_{gi} for each $i = 1,\cdots,n_g$ (σ_{gi} is one of $\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n$ but which is σ_{gi} is unknown). We denote the true value of the parameter by $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\pi_1^*,\cdots,\pi_k^*,\lambda_1^*,\cdots,\lambda_k^*,\rho_1^*,\cdots,\rho_k^*)$ and

set $\zeta_{ig}^* = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[Z_{ig}|\sigma_1(\omega) = s_1, \cdots, \sigma_n(\omega) = s_n]$ (see Equation (7)). In the setting described above, we first obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4 *(a) Let $\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t)}$ be estimators of π_g, λ_g, and ρ_g, respectively, with parameters n and t, and let $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t)}$ be an estimator of ζ_{ig} calculated according to Equation (8) based on $\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t-1)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t-1)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1)}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $g = 1, \cdots, k$. For any $d \in D$, if $\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi_g^*, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t)} = \lambda_g^*$ a.s., and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho_g^*$ hold as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$, we have*

$$\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \zeta_{ig}^*$$

as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$. Conversely, (b) in the case of $d = d_{H'}$, if $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \zeta_{ig}^*$ holds as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$, we have

$$\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi_g^*, \quad \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} = \lambda_g^* \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho_g^*$$

as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.

We note that Proposition 4 means that in the case of $d = d_{H'}$, $(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^*, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^*)$ $\Longleftrightarrow$ [the estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\epsilon)} = (\hat{\pi}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\pi}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \hat{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \hat{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)})$ from Algorithm H' converges to the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ of the parameter of the Laplace-like mixture], not that $(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^*, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^*) \Longleftrightarrow$ [the estimates $\hat{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \hat{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$ from Algorithm H' converge to the maximum likelihood estimates $\check{\lambda}_1, \cdots, \check{\lambda}_k, \check{\rho}_1, \cdots, \check{\rho}_k$ of the parameters of the sub-population distributions], as $n^*, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. From Proposition 4, Algorithm H' strongly consistently estimates the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of the Laplace-like mixture on A^* as $n, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ if the approach of $(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)})$ to $(\zeta_{11}^*, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^*)$ in Step 2.1 and the approach of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$ to $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ in Step 2.2 are alternately repeated through iteration steps.

Next, using Proposition 4, we consider whether Algorithm H' can estimate the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ of the parameter of the Laplace-like mixture on A^* with $d = d_{H'}$. We approach this problem by clarifying under what conditions and with what initial value Algorithm H' estimates the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$. We introduce the following two conditions:

C_1: For any $(z'_{11},\cdots,z'_{nk})\in[0,1]^{nk}$ that satisfies $\sum_{g=1}^{k} z'_{ig}=1$ for each $i=1,\cdots,n$ and $(z'_{11},\cdots,z'_{nk})$ $\neq(z_{11},\cdots,z_{nk})$,

$$\max_{(\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k)} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z'_{ig}\log q(s_i;\lambda_g,\rho_g) < \max_{(\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k)} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig}\log q(s_i;\lambda_g,\rho_g) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

holds as $n^*\longrightarrow\infty$.

Condition C_1 is satisfied, for example, if a sufficiently large number of observed strings are given and there does not exist a g-th subpopulation distribution that has a log likelihood greater than or equal to ℓ_g^* based on a portion of strings collected from the g-th subpopulation and/or including strings collected from other subpopulations, where ℓ_g^* represents the log likelihood of a g-th subpopulation distribution that has the maximum log likelihood based on all strings collected from the g-th subpopulation for each $g=1,\cdots,k$. By Proposition 10, maximizing the likelihood leads to estimating the true population distribution for the Laplace-like distribution on A^*, and C_1 is therefore a natural condition to exclude pathological situations.

C_2: The solution $(\zeta_{11}^{\dagger},\cdots,\zeta_{nk}^{\dagger},\lambda_1^{\dagger},\cdots,\lambda_k^{\dagger},\rho_1^{\dagger},\cdots,\rho_k^{\dagger})$ of the maximization problem of

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\zeta_{ig}\log q(s_i;\lambda_g,\rho_g) \tag{14}$$

with respect to $(\zeta_{11},\cdots,\zeta_{nk},\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k)\in(0,1)^{nk}\times(A^*)^k\times(0,\infty)^k$ is unique for given $s_1,\cdots,s_n\in A^*$.

We set

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}=\arg\max_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0)}\in\Theta}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)}\log q(s_i;\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)},\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)}) \tag{15}$$

for each $n,\tau\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, where $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)}$, $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,\tau,\epsilon)}$ represent estimates of ζ_{ig}, λ_g, and ρ_g, respectively, that Algorithm H' with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0)}$ returns at iteration step τ. $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ is an initial value with which Algorithm H' returns estimates of $\zeta_{11},\cdots,\zeta_{nk},\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k$ that maximize Equation (15) at iteration step τ of all possible initial values. The following theorem answers the question described above.

Theorem 2 *If conditions C_1 and C_2 hold and (i) there exists an initial value $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0)} = (\tilde{\pi}_1^{(n,0)}, \cdots, \tilde{\pi}_k^{(n,0)}, \tilde{\lambda}_1^{(n,0)}, \cdots, \tilde{\lambda}_k^{(n,0)}, \tilde{\rho}_1^{(n,0)}, \cdots, \tilde{\rho}_k^{(n,0)}) \in \Theta$ such that the estimate $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$ from Algorithm H' strongly consistently estimates $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as $n^*, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$, then $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is strongly consistently estimated by the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}$ from Algorithm H' with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ given by Equation (15) as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.*

Generally, in estimating a parameter of a model by using an iteration algorithm in which an initial value is arbitrarily chosen, the most reliable estimate is chosen after several initial values are provided and the behavior of the sequence of estimates from each of them is examined. From Theorem 2, in practical data analysis using the Laplace-like mixture on A^*, if a sufficiently large number of observed strings are given, choosing several initial values and adopting the estimate that maximizes Equation (15) for a sufficiently large t would be a realistic approach, especially when sequences of estimates from the initial values appear to converge to different points of the parameter space.

Applying Theorem 2, we can demonstrate that Algorithm H' converges to the EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^* that we seek but cannot write in an explicit manner. The definition of the convergence of a sequence of algorithms to an algorithm is introduced in Subsection A5.

Theorem 3 *If the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and the convergence testing constants in Step 2.3 are sufficiently small, Algorithm H' with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ that satisfies Equation (15) almost surely converges to the EM algorithm with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ for the Laplace-like mixture on A^* as $n^*, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.*

5 String clustering procedure based on the Laplace-like mixture on A^*

In this section, we derive a procedure for clustering strings based on the results obtained in the previous sections. We consider the problem of clustering n strings $s_1, \cdots, s_n \in A^*$ into k classes.

We assume a mixture model

$$\sum_{g=1}^{k} \pi_g q(s;\lambda_g,\rho_g) = \sum_{g=1}^{k} \frac{\pi_g}{(\rho_g+1)\left|\partial U(\lambda_g, d(s,\lambda_g))\right|} \left(\frac{\rho_g}{\rho_g+1}\right)^{d(s,\lambda_g)}$$

of k Laplace-like distributions $L_{A^*}(\lambda_1,\rho_1),\cdots,L_{A^*}(\lambda_k,\rho_k)$ on A^* with mixture coefficients $\pi_1,\cdots,\pi_k$ as a model generating $s_1,\cdots,s_n$. From Bayes' theorem, the posterior probability given $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ that s_i belongs to the g-th class is provided by

$$\pi_\theta(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{z}_g | s_1,\cdots,s_n) = \frac{\pi_g q(s_i;\lambda_g,\rho_g)}{\sum_{g'=1}^{k} \pi_{g'} q(s_i;\lambda_{g'},\rho_{g'})}$$

for each $i = 1,\cdots,n$ and $g = 1,\cdots,k$.

Corollary 1 *We suppose that the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and denote an estimate from Algorithm H′ with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)} \in \Theta$ satisfying Equation (15) by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}$. Then, the clustering procedure that*

$$\textit{if } g^* = \arg\max_{1\le g\le k} \pi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{z}_g | s_1,\cdots,s_n), \textit{ then classify } s_i \textit{ into the } g^*\textit{-th class}$$

for each $i = 1,\cdots,n$ is asymptotically optimal in the sense that the posterior probability of making correct classifications is maximized as $n^*,t,\tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.

6 Concluding remarks

In this study, using the probability theory on A^* developed in [19–21], we constructed the theory of the mixture model and the EM algorithm on A^* and derived the optimal procedure for unsupervised string clustering based on the theory. We encountered the interesting phenomenon that an EM algorithm for the Laplace-like mixture on A^*, which we sought, could not be written in an explicit manner because of the complex metric structure of A^*, but a sequence of algorithms (i.e., a sequence of sequences of computations) that strongly consistently estimates the parameters of the Laplace-like mixture and converges to the EM algorithm with probability one was obtained explicitly. This is different from the phenomena that an algorithm halts and that a sequence of

approximate solutions from an iterative algorithm converges. The authors addressed the problem of supervised string classification by constructing a theory of a statistical learning machine that works in A^* in [19]. Recently, the amount of string data has increased exponentially. The noncommutative topological monoid A^* of strings has interesting structures that are completely different, for example, from the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^p$ and Hilbert space L^2 and will become one of important spaces on which probability theory and methods of statistics and machine learning should be developed in the future.

Appendix

A1 Summary of the theory of random strings

In this subsection of the Appendix, we describe the definitions of several concepts in probability theory on a set of strings used in the main text. See the supplemental material of [20] for details. In the following, we refer to a set of a finite number of letters

$$A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{z-1}\}$$

as the alphabet. For example, $A = \{\mathtt{a}, \mathtt{c}, \mathtt{g}, \mathtt{t}\}$ is the alphabet for gene sequences. We denote an empty letter by e and set $\bar{A} = A \cup \{e\}$. We denote a set of $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \bar{A}^n$ of which a letter with the maximum frequency is uniquely determined by $[\bar{A}^n]$. A mapping $m_c : [\bar{A}^n] \to \bar{A}$ is defined as

$$m_c(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \text{a letter with the maximum frequency of } x_1, \cdots, x_n$$

and is called a consensus letter on $[\bar{A}^n]$.

Let $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, P)$ be a probability space. We call an $\bar{A}$-valued random variable on Ω a random letter and denote the set of all random letters by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})$. For the mapping $\varepsilon : \Omega \to \bar{A}$, which is defined as $\varepsilon(\omega) = e$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})$. The independence of $\{\alpha_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})$ is defined in the same manner as that of ordinary random variables. We denote a set of $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})$

for which there exists $x \in \bar{A}$ such that for any $y \in \bar{A} \setminus \{x\}$, $q(x) > q(y)$ holds by $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})]$, where q is a probability function of a distribution of α. A mapping $M_c : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})] \to \bar{A}$ is defined as

$$M_c(\alpha) = x \in \bar{A} \text{ such that } [q(x) > q(y), \forall y \in \bar{A} \setminus \{x\}]$$

and is called a consensus letter on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})]$. We denote a set of $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})^n$ for which a consensus letter of $\alpha_1(\omega), \cdots, \alpha_n(\omega)$ is uniquely determined for any $\omega \in \Omega$ by $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})^n]$. A mapping $\mu_c : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})^n] \to \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})$ is defined as

$$\mu_c(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)(\omega) = m_c(\alpha_1(\omega), \cdots, \alpha_n(\omega))$$

and called a consensus letter on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, \bar{A})^n]$.

In common usage in computer science, a string on the alphabet $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{z-1}\}$ is a finite sequence of elements of A. However, in this study, we define a string as follows, although both definitions are essentially identical: A sequence $s = \{x_j \in \bar{A} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ of elements of $\bar{A}$ is a string on A if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\text{(i) there exists } h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \text{ such that } x_h = e, \text{ and (ii) } x_j = e \text{ implies } x_{j+1} = e.$$

In other words, we define a string on A as a finite sequence of elements of A to which the infinite sequence $\{e, \cdots\}$ of empty letters is appended. In the following, by naturally extending the above definition of a string, we define a random string in a manner in which it can realize strings of varying lengths. We denote the set of all strings on A by A^*. Let d be a distance function on A^*. If $x_k \neq e$ and $x_{k+1} = e$ hold for $s = \{x_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \in A^*$, we set

$$s \cdot t = \{x_1, \cdots, x_k, y_1, y_2, \cdots\}$$

for any $t = \{y_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \in A^*$ and call $s \cdot t$ the concatenation of s and t. A function $|\cdot| : A^* \to \mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$|s| = \min\{h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : x_h = e\} - 1, \ s = \{x_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$$

and called the length on A^*. Let $(s_1, \cdots, s_n) \in (A^*)^n$ and $s_i = \{x_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$. We denote a set of $(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ for which a consensus letter of $x_{1j}, \cdots, x_{nj}$ is uniquely determined for

any $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ by $[(A^*)^n]$. A mapping $\boldsymbol{m}_c : [(A^*)^n] \to A^*$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \{m_c(x_{1j}, \cdots, x_{nj}) : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$$

and is called a consensus sequence on $[(A^*)^n]$. A function $\boldsymbol{v}_c : [(A^*)^n] \to [0, \infty)$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{v}_c(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c(s_1, \cdots, s_n))$$

and called a mean absolute deviation around $\boldsymbol{m}_c(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ on $[(A^*)^n]$ (this quantity was simply called a variance on $[(A^*)^n]$ in [20]).

Next, we introduce a random string. A sequence of random letters $\sigma = \{\alpha_j \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \overline{A}) : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ is a random string if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) for any $\omega \in \Omega$ there exists $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\alpha_h(\omega) = e$, and

(ii) $\alpha_j(\omega) = e$ for $\omega \in \Omega$ implies $\alpha_{j+1}(\omega) = e$.

We denote the set of all random strings by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$. A function $|\cdot| : \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*) \to \mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$|\sigma| = \min\{h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \alpha_h = \varepsilon\} - 1, \ \sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$$

and is called the length on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$. The random string defined above can be regarded as a special case of a discrete stochastic process. Therefore, a distribution of a random string can be defined as follows: Let $\sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$. A set function $Q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k} : 2^{\overline{A}^k} \to [0, 1]$ is defined as

$$Q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k}(E) = P(\{\omega \in \Omega : (\alpha_{j_1}(\omega), \cdots, \alpha_{j_k}(\omega)) \in E\})$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $j_1, \cdots, j_k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ that satisfy $j_1 < \cdots < j_k$. $Q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k}$ is a probability measure on $2^{\overline{A}^k}$ and is called a finite-dimensional distribution of σ at sites $j_1, \cdots, j_k$. A function $q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k} : \overline{A}^k \to [0, 1]$ is defined as

$$q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k}(x_1, \cdots, x_k) = Q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k}(\{(x_1, \cdots, x_k)\})$$

and is called a probability function of $Q_{\sigma; j_1, \cdots, j_k}$. For the probability function $q_{\sigma; 1, \cdots, |\sigma|}$ of the finite-dimensional distribution at sites $1, \cdots, |\sigma|$ of $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$, we define the function $q_\sigma : A^* \to [0, 1]$

as

$$q_\sigma(s) = \begin{cases} q_{\sigma;1,\cdots,|\sigma|}(x_1,\cdots,x_{|\sigma|}) & (\text{for } x_1,\cdots,x_{|\sigma|} \in \bar{A} \text{ such that} \\ & s = (x_1,\cdots,x_{|\sigma|},e,\cdots) \text{ if } |\sigma| \geq |s|) \\ 0 & (\text{if } |\sigma| < |s|). \end{cases}$$

q_σ is a probability function on A^*. The independence of the random strings is defined in the following manner: (1) For the finite case, $\sigma_1 = \{\alpha_{1j} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\},\cdots,\sigma_n = \{\alpha_{nj} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ are independent if $\{\alpha_{1j} : j \in J_1\},\cdots,\{\alpha_{nj} : j \in J_n\}$ are independent for any nonempty finite set $J_1,\cdots,J_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$. (2) For the countably infinite case, $\{\sigma_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ are independent if $\sigma_{i_1},\cdots,\sigma_{i_k}$ are independent for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $i_1,\cdots,i_k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

We denote a set of $\sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ for which a consensus letter of α_j is uniquely determined for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ by $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)]$. A mapping $\boldsymbol{M}_c : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)] \to A^*$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = \{M_c(\alpha_j) : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\},\ \sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$$

and is called a consensus sequence on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)]$. A function $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_c : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)] \to [0,\infty)$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_c(\sigma) = \sum_{s \in A^*} d(s, \boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)) q_\sigma(s)$$

and called a mean absolute deviation around $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)]$ (this quantity was simply called a variance on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)]$ in [20]). We denote $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_c(\sigma)$ obtained by replacing $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ on the right-hand side of the above equation with a median string $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)$ introduced in Definition 2 in Subsection A2 and a mode string $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma)$ introduced in Section 2 by $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}(\sigma)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_m(\sigma)$, respectively. We refer to $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}(\sigma)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_m(\sigma)$ as mean absolute deviations around $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)$ and around $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma)$, respectively.

Let $(\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n$ and $\sigma_i = \{\alpha_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ for each $i = 1,\cdots,n$. $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]$ and $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]_\ell$ represent sets of $(\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n)$ for which a consensus letter of $\alpha_{1j}(\omega),\cdots,\alpha_{nj}(\omega)$ is uniquely determined for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ and for any $j \in \{1,\cdots,\ell\}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, respectively. A mapping $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n] \to \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_c(\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_n)(\omega) = \{\mu_c(\alpha_{1j},\cdots,\alpha_{nj})(\omega) : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$$

and is called a consensus sequence on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]$. A mapping $\upsilon : [\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n] \to \mathcal{M}(\Omega, [0, \infty))$ is defined as

$$\upsilon_c(\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n)(\omega) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(\sigma_i(\omega), \boldsymbol{\mu}_c(\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n)(\omega))$$

and called a mean absolute deviation around $\boldsymbol{\mu}_c(\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n)(\omega))$ on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]$ (this quantity was simply called a variance on $[\mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)^n]$ in [20]).

A2 Basic properties of the Laplace-like distribution on A^*

In this subsection, we describe the basic properties of $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$ introduced in Section 2. We consider a distribution on A^* that has a parameter $m \in A^*$. If there exists $d \in D$ such that the probability function $q(s; m)$ of the distribution satisfies the conditions that $d(s, m) < d(s', m)$ for $s, s' \in A^*$ implies $q(s; m) > q(s'; m)$ and that $d(s, m) = d(s', m)$ implies $q(s; m) = q(s'; m)$, we say that m is a location parameter of the distribution with respect to d. In other words, if $q(s; m)$ is unimodal at m and symmetric with respect to m, then m is a location parameter. We next consider a distribution on A^* that has a parameter $v \in (0, \infty)$. We say that v is a dispersion parameter if the distribution approaches the uniform distribution on A^* as $v \longrightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 5 *The parameters λ and ρ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$ are location and dispersion parameters, respectively.*

Proof. $q(s; \lambda, \rho)$ monotonically decreases from $1/(\rho + 1) > 0$ to zero as $d(s, \lambda)$ increases from zero because $(\rho/(\rho + 1))^{d(s,\lambda)}$ and $1/|\partial U(\lambda, d(s, \lambda))|$ monotonically decrease from one to zero as $d(s, \lambda)$ increases from zero. In addition, $q(s; \lambda, \rho)$ depends on s only through $d(s, \lambda)$, and therefore, $q(s; \lambda, \rho) = q(s'; \lambda, \rho)$ holds if $d(s, \lambda) = d(s', \lambda)$ for $s, s' \in A^*$. Thus, λ is a location parameter. $q(s; \lambda, \rho)$ approaches the uniform distribution on A^* as ρ increases if and only if $q(\lambda; \lambda, \rho)$ decreases as ρ increases, which clearly holds from $q(\lambda; \lambda, \rho) = 1/(\rho + 1)$. Hence, ρ is a dispersion parameter. ■

Here, we reconsider the conventional definition of a median string of strings to describe a result on the relation of parameter λ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ with a median string and a consensus sequence of a random string σ that is distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$. A median string of $s_1,\cdots,s_n \in A^*$ cannot be defined as a middle string after arranging $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ in ascending order because A^* is not a totally ordered set. Therefore, [17] introduced the median string and set median string of $S \subset A^*$ as

$$\mathrm{med}(S) = \arg\min_{s\in A^*} \sum_{t\in S} d(s,t), \quad \mathrm{med}'(S) = \arg\min_{s\in S} \sum_{t\in S} d(s,t), \tag{16}$$

respectively, because a median $\mathrm{med}(x_1,\cdots,x_n)$ of $x_1,\cdots,x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ is characterized as

$$\mathrm{med}(x_1,\cdots,x_n) = \arg\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - y|, \text{ or equivalently, } \mathrm{med}(x_1,\cdots,x_n) = \arg\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - y|.$$

In addition to the characterization as a minimizer of the first-order absolute moment, a median has another characterization by [43] as the deepest point in the sample or the distribution (Tukey's depth median). These two characterizations of a median are equivalent in $\mathbb{R}$ but not in $\mathbb{R}^p$ (the p-dimensional real vector space) for $p \geq 2$, and they define different multidimensional medians (see, for example, [4, 9, 36, 37]). However, the characterization of a median as the deepest point in the sample or the distribution cannot be used to define a median string because the deepest point is defined using the concepts of the total order and projection. A median string is not necessarily unique, similar to an ordinary median on $\mathbb{R}$. A median string and a consensus sequence play an important role as a measure of the center of strings in computer science. See, for example, [7, 14, 15, 30, 34, 35, 38] for theoretical results and applications of a median string.

We consider the problem of introducing a median string of a probability distribution on A^* or a random string. One natural, but tentative, definition, which extends Equation (16) to a probabilistic version, is as follows:

Definition 2 We suppose that a distance d on A^* is given and that a random string σ has a distribution on A^* with a probability function $q(s)$. We define a median string of σ with respect to the

distance d as

$$M(\sigma) = \arg\min_{s \in A^*} \sum_{t \in A^*} d(s,t)q(t).$$

The definition of a median string of strings by Equation (16) is apparently reasonable, but in Definition 2, which is a natural extension of this definition to a random string, a problem in defining a median string as a minimizer of the first-order absolute moment arises. We consider A^* with the Levenshtein distance d_L. In $\mathbb{R}^p$, spheres with centers of different points and equal radii have equal sizes, whereas in A^*, spheres with centers of different strings and equal radii do not have necessarily equal sizes. There exist more strings near a longer string in A^*. In other words, spaces $\mathbb{R}^p$ and A^* have different metric structures, but the definition of a median string of strings by Equation (16) and Definition 2 do not consider the differences between the metric structures of these spaces. We consider a unimodal and symmetric distribution on A^* with respect to $m \in A^*$ (for example, $L_{A^*}(m,\rho)$). Choosing $m' \in A^*$ such that $|m'| > |m|$, we observe that

$$\sum_{s \in A^*} d_L(s,m)q(s) < \sum_{s \in A^*} d_L(s,m')q(s)$$

is not guaranteed because $|U(m,n)| < |U(m',n)|$ holds for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, as illustrated in the following example. Therefore, m is not necessarily a median string according to the above definition.

Example 1 We set $A = \{0,1\}$ and consider the distribution on A^* with the probability function $q(o) = 0.2, q(0) = q(1) = 0.15, q(00) = q(01) = q(10) = q(11) = 0.125$, and $q(s) = 0$ for other $s \in A^*$, where an infinite sequence $e\cdots$ of empty letters connected to the end of each string was dropped. This distribution is unimodal at o (thus, o is a unique mode string) and symmetric with respect to o. The mean absolute deviations around o, 0, and 00 with respect to d_L are equal to

$$\sum_{s \in A^*} d_L(s,o)q(s) = 1.3, \ \sum_{s \in A^*} d_L(s,0)q(s) = 0.975, \text{ and } \sum_{s \in A^*} d_L(s,00)q(s) = 1.35,$$

respectively, and therefore, it is not minimized around o. ■

A median string of a random string is expected to work as a measure of the location of its distribution. For example, for the normal and Laplace distributions on $\mathbb{R}$, we have "the mode = the

median (= the expected value)." It is desirable that a median string be defined such that the similar relation of "the mode string = the median string" holds for unimodal and symmetric distributions on A^*. Considering the above-mentioned difference in the metric structure between A^* and $\mathbb{R}^p$, Definition 2 can be modified as follows.

Definition 3 Let $q(s)$ be the probability function of the distribution of a random string σ and $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a monotonically increasing function of both variables. We define the median string $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma;\varphi)$ of σ with respect to φ as

$$\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma;\varphi) = \arg\min_{m \in A^*} \sum_{s \in A^*} \varphi(d(s,m),|m|)q(s). \tag{17}$$

Under the definition of a median string of a random string by Equation (17), if two strings minimize the sum $\sum_{t \in A^*} d(s,t)q(t)$, the shorter one is chosen as a median string. Natural examples of $\varphi(d(s,m),|m|)$ include $|U(m,d(s,m))|$ and $|\partial U(m,d(s,m))|$.

Example 2 We consider the same probability function on A^* as in Example 1 under $\varphi(d(s,m),|m|) = |\partial U(m,d_L(s,m))|$. The expected size of the sphere of strings with respect to d_L is minimized to $\sum_{s \in A^*} |\partial U(o,d_L(s,o))|q(s) = 2.8$ when o is the center of the sphere. For example, it is equal to $\sum_{s \in A^*} |\partial U(0,d_L(s,0))|q(s) = 4.775$ when 0 is the center and, noting $|\partial U(00,0)| = 1$, $|\partial U(00,1)| = 7$, and $|\partial U(00,2)| = 17$, it is calculated as $\sum_{s \in A^*} |\partial U(00,d_L(s,00))|q(s) = 11.0$ when 00 is the center. ■

Definition 3 was introduced by modifying Definition 2 to consider the difference in the metric structure between $\mathbb{R}^p$ and A^*. In contrast to $\mathbb{R}^p$, there exist several intrinsic distance functions on A^*, as described in Section 2. Consequently, it is not guaranteed that the median string provided by Definition 3 is equal to the mode string for all distance functions and unimodal and symmetric distributions on A^*. However, the point here is that Examples 1 and 2 indicate that if we translate a definition in $\mathbb{R}^p$ into A^* without considering the difference in the structure between $\mathbb{R}^p$ and A^*, the translated definition in A^* may not have some of properties of the original definition in $\mathbb{R}^p$. Furthermore, noting that even a median string as a minimizer of the sum of distances is approximately

computed and that the question of finding a general formula for assessing the volume of a sphere of strings is open, the above discussion also means that the complex situation became more complex. However, the following lemma indicates that if $d = d_{H'}$ and a random string has a unimodal and symmetric distribution, there exists an explicit relation among its mode string, median string provided in Definition 2, and consensus sequence, and consequently, the situation is somewhat tractable. Although in Subsection A1, the symbol $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ is used when a consensus sequence of a random string $\sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ is unique, in Lemma 3 and Proposition 6 below, $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$ represents a sequence obtained by ordering one of letters generated by α_j with the highest probability with respect to $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Lemma 3 *If (i) $d = d_{H'}$ and a random string σ has a distribution on A^* whose probability function $q(s)$ satisfies the conditions that (ii) $d_{H'}(s,m) < d_{H'}(s',m)$ implies $q(s) > q(s')$ for $m \in A^*$ and (iii) $d_{H'}(s,m) = d_{H'}(s',m)$ implies $q(s) = q(s')$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $t \in A^*$ satisfying $|t| = \ell$, $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = m \cdot t$ holds.*

Proof. (Step 1) Let $\sigma = \{\alpha_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ and $m = \{m_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. We arbitrarily choose $j \in \{1, \cdots, |m|\}$. Let $A(j, m_j)$ be a set of strings obtained by deleting m_j from a string in A^*, the j-th letter of which is equal to m_j, i.e., if $\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, m_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\} \in A^*$, then $\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \cdots\} \in A(j, m_j)$. All strings in A^* with the j-th letter equal to m_j can be created by inserting m_j between the $(j-1)$-th and j-th letters of strings in $A(j, m_j)$. The marginal probability of $\alpha_j(\omega) = m_j$ is given by

$$q_j(m_j) = \sum_{\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \cdots\} \in A(j, m_j)} q(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, m_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}). \tag{18}$$

We arbitrarily choose $y_j \in A \setminus \{m_j\}$. Defining $A(j, y_j)$ in the same manner as $A(j, m_j)$, we have $A(j, m_j) = A(j, y_j)$. Therefore, the marginal probability of $\alpha_j(\omega) = y_j$ is equal to

$$q_j(y_j) = \sum_{\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \cdots\} \in A(j, m_j)} q(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, y_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}). \tag{19}$$

We have

$$d_{H'}(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, m_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}, m) < d_{H'}(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, y_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}, m)$$

for any $\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \cdots\} \in A(j, m_j)$. Thus,

$$q(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, m_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}) > q(\{x_1, \cdots, x_{j-1}, y_j, x_{j+1}, \cdots\}) \tag{20}$$

holds from condition (ii). Combining Equations (18), (19), and (20) provides

$$q_j(m_j) > q_j(y_j). \tag{21}$$

Let $B(j)$ be a set of strings in A^* with the j-th letter equal to e. We set $B(j,0) = \{o\}$ and denote a set of strings in $B(j)$ with a nonempty k-th letter and a $(k+1)$-th letter of e by $B(j,k)$ for each $k = 1, \cdots, j-1$. We have $B(j) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{j-1} B(j,k)$ and $B(j,k) \cap B(j,k') = \emptyset$ if $k \neq k'$ for $k, k' \in \{0, \cdots, j-1\}$. Thus,

$$q_j(e) = \sum_{s \in B(j)} q(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \sum_{s \in B(j,k)} q(s) \tag{22}$$

holds. For each $k = 0, \cdots, j-2$, $B'(j,k)$ represents a set of strings obtained by substituting (1) es at the $(k+1)$-th to $(j-1)$-th sites of each $s \in B(j,k)$ with arbitrary nonempty letters, (2) e at the j-th site with m_j, and (3) es at the $(j+1)$-th to $(2j-1-k)$-th sites with arbitrary nonempty letters. We denote a set of strings obtained by substituting e at the j-th site of each $s \in B(j, j-1)$ with m_j by $B'(j, j-1)$ and then set $B'(j) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{j-1} B'(j,k)$. $B'(j)$ is a subset of strings with the j-letter equal to m_j, and we have $B'(j,k) \cap B'(j,k') = \emptyset$ for $k \neq k'$. Therefore,

$$q_j(m_j) > \sum_{s \in B'(j)} q(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \sum_{s \in B'(j,k)} q(s) \tag{23}$$

holds. Noting that $|B(j,k)| = |B'(j,k)|$ and $d_{H'}(s,m) > d_{H'}(s',m)$ for any $s \in B(j,k)$ and $s' \in B'(j,k)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \sum_{s \in B(j,k)} q(s) < \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \sum_{s \in B'(j,k)} q(s) \tag{24}$$

from condition (ii). Combining Equations (22), (23), and (24) leads to

$$q_j(e) < q_j(m_j). \tag{25}$$

From Equations (21) and (25), the consensus letter of the marginal distribution of α_j is equal to m_j for each $j = 1, \cdots, |m|$.

(Step 2) We arbitrarily choose $j \geq |m|+1$. For any $x \in A$, let $C_1(j,x)$ be a set of strings that have x at the j-th site, nonempty letters at all sites before the j-th, and es at all sites after the j-th and $C_2(j,x)$ be a set of strings that have x at the j-th site, nonempty letters at all sites before the j-th, nonempty letters at a finite number of consecutive sites more than or equal to one from the $(j+1)$-th, and es at all of the following sites. Because a set of strings that have x at the j-th site is represented by $C_1(j,x) \cup C_2(j,x)$, we have

$$q_j(x) = \sum_{s \in C_1(j,x) \cup C_2(j,x)} q(s). \tag{26}$$

We set $C(j,x,r) = \{s \in C_1(j,x) \cup C_2(j,x) : d_{H'}(s,m) = r\}$ for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $x \in A$, we have $C_1(j,x) \cup C_2(j,x) = \bigcup_{0 \leq r < \infty} C(j,x,r)$ and $C(j,x,r) \cap C(j,x,r') = \emptyset$ if $r \neq r'$. Thus,

$$q_j(x) = \sum_{0 \leq r < \infty} \sum_{s \in C(j,x,r)} q(s).$$

holds from Equation (26). Therefore, noting $|C(j,x,r)| = |C(j,x',r)|$ for any $x, x' \in A$ and condition (iii), we have

$$q_j(x) = q_j(x'). \tag{27}$$

Equation (27) means that all nonempty letters are consensus letters (i.e., have a maximum marginal probability) at the j-th site if $q_j(x) > q_j(e)$.

For a nonempty letter to have a maximum marginal probability at each site, it is necessary that there exist strings that have a nonempty letter at each site. However, A^* is a set of sequences obtained by concatenating a finite sequence of nonempty letters with an infinite sequence of es, and a probability function of any distribution on A^* assigns probabilities only to strings in A^*. Hence, there exists $J_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $j \geq J_0$, then

$$q_j(x) < q_j(e) \tag{28}$$

holds for any $x \in A$. From the result of Step 1, we have $J_0 \geq |m|+1$. We set $J_0^* = \min\{J_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \text{if } j \geq J_0, \text{ Equation (28) holds for any } x \in A\}$. From Equation (27), to conclude $M_c(\sigma) = m \cdot t$, it suffices to demonstrate that

$$q_j(x) > q_j(e) \tag{29}$$

holds for any j satisfying $|m|+1 \le j \le J_0^* - 1$ if $J_0^* \ge |m|+2$.

(Step 3) Let $D_1(j,x)$ be a set of strings that have $x \in A$ at the j-th site, nonempty letters at the first to the $(j-1)$-th sites, and es at all sites after the $(j+1)$-th. We denote a set of strings that have x at the j-th site, nonempty letters at the first to the $(j-1)$-th sites and at the $(j+1)$-th, and es at all sites after the $(j+1)$-th by $D_2(j,x)$. $D_3(j,x)$ represents a set of strings that have x at the j-th site, nonempty letters at the first to the $(j-1)$-th sites and at a finite number of consecutive sites more than or equal to two from the $(j+1)$-th, and es at all of the following sites. Because $D_i(j,x) \cap D_{i'}(j,x) = \emptyset$ holds if $i \neq i'$ for $i, i' \in \{1,2,3\}$ and a set of strings that have x at the j-th site is represented by $D_1(j,x) \cup D_2(j,x) \cup D_3(j,x)$, we have

$$q_j(x) = \sum_{s \in D_1(j,x)} q(s) + \sum_{s \in D_2(j,x)} q(s) + \sum_{s \in D_3(j,x)} q(s). \tag{30}$$

Let $D_4(j,x)$ be a set of strings that have x at the $(j+1)$-th site, nonempty letters at the first to the j-th sites, and es at all sites after the $(j+1)$-th and $D_5(j,x)$ be a set of strings that have x at the $(j+1)$-th site, nonempty letters at the first to the j-th sites and at a finite number of consecutive sites more than or equal to one from the $(j+2)$-th, and es at all of the following sites. $D_4(j,x) \cap D_5(j,x) = \emptyset$ holds and a set of strings that have x at the $(j+1)$-th site is written as $D_4(j,x) \cup D_5(j,x)$. Consequently,

$$q_{j+1}(x) = \sum_{s \in D_4(j,x)} q(s) + \sum_{s \in D_5(j,x)} q(s) \tag{31}$$

holds. We set $D_i(j,x,r) = \{s \in D_i(j,x) : d_{H'}(s,m) = r\}$ for each $i = 2, \cdots, 5$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $B_i(j,x) = \bigcup_{0 \le r < \infty} B_i(j,x,r)$ and $B_i(j,x,r) \cap B_i(j,x,r') = \emptyset$ if $r \neq r'$. Furthermore, $|D_2(j,x,r)| = |D_4(j,x,r)|$ and $|D_3(j,x,r)| = |D_5(j,x,r)|$ hold. Thus, noting condition (iii), we obtain

$$\sum_{s \in D_2(j,x)} q(s) = \sum_{0 \le r < \infty} \sum_{s \in B_2(j,x,r)} q(s) = \sum_{0 \le r < \infty} \sum_{s \in B_4(j,x,r)} q(s) = \sum_{s \in D_4(j,x)} q(s)$$

and $\sum_{s \in D_3(j,x)} q(s) = \sum_{s \in D_5(j,x)} q(s)$. Therefore, from Equations (30) and (31), we have

$$q_j(x) > q_{j+1}(x), \tag{32}$$

i.e., $q_j(x)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $j \ge |m|+1$.

Let $D(j,e)$ be a set of strings that have nonempty letters at consecutive sites more than or equal to zero and fewer than or equal to $j-1$ from the first site and es at all of the following sites and $D_6(j+1,e)$ be a set of strings that have nonempty letters at the first to the j-th sites and es at all of the following sites. $D(j+1,e) \cap D_6(j+1,e) = \emptyset$ holds, and sets of strings that have e at the j-th site and at the $(j+1)$-th site are written as $D(j,e)$ and $D(j,e) \cup D_6(j+1,e)$, respectively. Therefore, we have

$$q_j(e) = \sum_{s \in D(j,e)} q(s) < \sum_{s \in D(j,e)} q(s) + \sum_{s \in D_6(j+1,e)} q(s) = q_{j+1}(e), \tag{33}$$

i.e., $q_j(e)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $j \geq |m|+1$. From Equations (32) and (33), we obtain Equation (29). Hence, $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = m \cdot t$ has been demonstrated.

(Step 4) From the results of Steps 1 to 3, putting $\boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = \{m_1, \cdots, m_{|m|}, t_1, \cdots, t_\ell, e, \cdots\} = \{m'_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s \in A^*} d_H(s_j, m'_j) q(s) &< \sum_{s \in A^*} d_H(s_j, y_j) q(s), \ j = 1, \cdots, |m|, |m|+\ell+1, \cdots, \\ \sum_{s \in A^*} d_H(s_j, m'_j) q(s) &\leq \sum_{s \in A^*} d_H(s_j, y_j) q(s), \ j = |m|+1, \cdots, |m|+\ell \end{aligned}$$

for any $y_j \in \bar{A}$ satisfying $y_j \neq m'_j$, where $s = \{s_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\sum_{s \in A^*} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} d_H(s_j, m'_j) q(s) < \sum_{s \in A^*} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} d_H(s_j, y_j) q(s). \tag{34}$$

If $d = d_{H'}$, then

$$\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \arg\min_{s' \in A^*} \sum_{s \in A^*} d_{H'}(s, s') q(s) = \arg\min_{s' \in A^*} \sum_{s \in A^*} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} d_H(s_j, s'_j) q(s) \tag{35}$$

holds, where $s' = \{s'_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. Combining Equations (34) and (35) provides $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma)$. The proof is completed. ■

Lemma 3 states that the mode string is not equal to the median string (and the consensus sequence) for unimodal and symmetric distributions on A^* in contrast to $\mathbb{R}$, which implies that distributions on A^* are intractable compared with those on $\mathbb{R}$. Noting Step 3 in the above proof, we observe that the larger the dispersion of the distribution (ρ in the case of $L_{A^*}(\lambda, \rho)$) is, the larger ℓ

is. The relation between the mode string and the consensus sequence for unimodal and symmetric distributions on A^* described in Lemma 3, especially the fact that the probabilities of all nonempty letters are uniform at the $(|m|+1)$-th to $(|m|+\ell)$-th sites, underlies the theoretical results in the case of $d = d_{H'}$ described in the main text. We immediately obtain the following proposition on parameter λ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ from Lemma 3.

Proposition 6 *We suppose that a random string σ is distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$. (a) For any $d \in D$, we have $\boldsymbol{M}_m(\sigma) = \lambda$. (b) If $d = d_{H'}$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $t \in A^*$ satisfying $|t| = \ell$, we have $\boldsymbol{M}(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}_c(\sigma) = \lambda \cdot t$.*

Proof. Obvious from Proposition 5 and Lemma 3. ■

With respect to parameter ρ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 7 *If a random string σ is distributed according to $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$, we have $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_m(\sigma) = \rho$ for any $d \in D$.*

Proof. Setting $r = d(s,\lambda)$ and noting that the power series $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} r(\rho/(\rho+1))^r$ converges and its sum is equal to $\rho(\rho+1)$ from $\rho/(\rho+1) < 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{s\in A^*} d(s,\lambda) q(s;\lambda,\rho) &= \frac{1}{\rho+1} \sum_{s\in A^*} \frac{d(s,\lambda)}{\left|\partial U(\lambda, d(s,\lambda))\right|} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)^{d(s,\lambda)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho+1} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{r}{|\partial U(\lambda,r)|} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)^{r} |\partial U(\lambda,r)| = \frac{1}{\rho+1}\rho(\rho+1) = \rho\end{aligned}$$

for any $d \in D$. Thus, from Part (a) of Proposition 6, we have $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_m(\sigma) = \rho$ for any $d \in D$. ■

It is well known that among all continuous distributions with the support $(0,\infty)$ the mean of which is equal to a given positive real number, the exponential distribution has the maximum entropy. Among all continuous distributions with the support $\mathbb{R}$ that have a given mean and variance, the normal distribution has the maximum entropy. Similarly, the Laplace distribution maximizes the entropy among all continuous distributions with the support $\mathbb{R}$ that satisfy the condition that the first absolute moment about some fixed point is equal to a given positive real number [16]. The following proposition states that $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ has a similar property.

Proposition 8 *Among all distributions on A^* satisfying the condition that the first absolute moment about some fixed string $m \in A^*$ is equal to a given positive real number v, $L_{A^*}(m,v)$ maximizes the entropy.*

Proof. In this proof, we denote a value of a function q on A^* at s by q_s. Although the constraints are

$$\text{(i) } q_s > 0, \forall s \in A^*, \quad \text{(ii) } \sum_{s\in A^*} q_s = 1, \quad \text{(iii) } \sum_{s\in A^*} d(s,m)q_s = v,$$

we first seek a function that maximizes the entropy among functions on A^* that satisfy constraints (ii) and (iii). The Lagrangian is

$$L = -\sum_{s\in A^*} q_s \log q_s - c_1\left(\sum_{s\in A^*} q_s - 1\right) - c_2\left(\sum_{s\in A^*} d(s,m)q_s - v\right)$$

for undetermined multipliers $c_1, c_2 \neq 0$, and therefore, we have $\partial L/\partial q_t = -\log q_t - 1 - c_1 - c_2 d(t,m)$ for each $t \in A^*$. Thus, the necessary condition to maximize the entropy under constraints (ii) and (iii) is given by

$$q_t = \exp(-1-c_1)\exp(-c_2 d(t,m)). \tag{36}$$

We set $d(t,m) = r$. Noting that $c_2 > 0$ from $q_t \leq 1$ and Equation (36) and that $\log((v+1)/v) > 0$ from $v > 0$ and making the parametrization of $c_2 = \log((v+1)/v)$ provides

$$q_t = \exp(-1-c_1)\left(\frac{v}{v+1}\right)^r. \tag{37}$$

From $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(v/v+1)^r = 1/(1-v/(v+1)) = v+1$, we have

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{v+1}\left(\frac{v}{v+1}\right)^r = 1. \tag{38}$$

Equation (36) holds for any $t \in A^*$ if and only if $d(t,m) = d(t',m)$ implies $q_t = q_{t'}$ for $t, t' \in A^*$ because c_1 and c_2 are constants and q_t depends on t only through $d(t,m)$. Moreover, the number of $t' \in A^*$ such that $d(t',m) = r$ is equal to $|\partial U(m,r)|$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, noting Equations (37) and (38) and constraint (ii), we obtain

$$q_t = \frac{1}{(v+1)\left|\partial U(m,d(t,m))\right|}\left(\frac{v}{v+1}\right)^{d(t,m)}.$$

The above q_t also satisfies constraint (i). Because the entropy is a concave function, its maximization subject to linear constraints by Lagrange's method provides a global maximum. The proof is completed. ■

A3 Estimation procedure of parameter λ under the Levenshtein distance

In this subsection, we describe an estimation procedure of the location parameter λ of $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ in the case of $d = d_L$.

1 Seek

$$\breve{\lambda}^{(0)} = \arg\min_{\lambda\in A^*} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_L(s_i,\lambda)$$

using an existing algorithm (for example, [17, 29, 30]).

2 Compute

$$\breve{\rho}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_L(s_i,\breve{\lambda}^{(0)}), \quad F_*^{(0)} = F(\breve{\lambda}^{(0)},\breve{\rho}^{(0)})$$

(see Equation (5) for the definition of F).

3 For $t = 1,2,\cdots,$

3.1 Set $\{s_\gamma \in A^* : \gamma \in \Gamma^{(t-1)}\} = \partial U(\breve{\lambda}^{(t-1)},1)$ and compute

$$v_\gamma = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_L(s_i,s_\gamma), \quad F(s_\gamma,v_\gamma)$$

for each $\gamma \in \Gamma^{(t-1)}$.

3.2 If there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma^{(t-1)}$ such that $F(s_\gamma,v_\gamma) < F_*^{(t-1)}$ holds, set

$$\gamma^* = \arg\min_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{(t-1)}} F(s_\gamma,v_\gamma), \quad \breve{\lambda}^{(t)} = s_{\gamma^*}, \quad \breve{\rho}^{(t)} = v_{\gamma^*}, \quad F_*^{(t)} = F(\breve{\lambda}^{(t)},\breve{\rho}^{(t)}), \quad t = t+1$$

and return to Step 3.1. Otherwise, terminate the iteration and return

$$\breve{\lambda} = \breve{\lambda}^{(t-1)}, \quad \breve{\rho} = \breve{\rho}^{(t-1)}.$$

A4 Strong consistency of maximum likelihood estimators in cases where the parameter space is A^* and $A^* \times (0, \infty)$

Maximum likelihood estimators for string parameters are strongly consistent under quite general conditions, as are maximum likelihood estimators for parameters that are real numbers [41, 47]. In this subsection, we describe propositions with respect to the strong consistency of maximum likelihood estimators in cases where the parameter space is A^* and $A^* \times (0, \infty)$. The proposition for the latter case underlies Theorems 1 and 2 and consequently also Theorem 3 and Corollary 1.

Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ have a probability function $q(s;\theta)$ with a parameter $\theta \in A^*$. θ^* represents the true value of the parameter. We set

$$\eta(\theta', \theta) = \sum_{s \in A^*} \log(q(s;\theta)) q(s;\theta') \tag{39}$$

for any $\theta, \theta' \in A^*$. It is verified that $\eta(\theta', \theta) \leq \eta(\theta', \theta')$ holds for any $\theta \in A^*$ in the same manner as in the case where the sample and parameter spaces are $\mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 9 *We suppose that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ (i) are independent and (ii) have the identical probability function $q(s;\theta)$ with a parameter $\theta \in A^*$ and that (iii) $q(s;\theta)$ has the support A^*. We denote the realization of σ_i by s_i for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and the maximum likelihood estimator of θ based on $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ by $\breve{\theta}^{(n)}$. If (iv) $\eta(\theta^*, \theta) < \eta(\theta^*, \theta^*)$ holds for any $\theta \in A^* \setminus \{\theta^*\}$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_0$, we have $\breve{\theta}^{(n)} = \theta^*$ a.s.*

Proof. We denote the log likelihood function of θ based on $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ by $\ell(\theta) = \ell(\theta; s_1, \cdots, s_n)$. From condition (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}\left[\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta)\right] &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\theta)] = \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}[\log q(\sigma_1;\theta)] \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in A^*} \log(q(s_1;\theta)) q(s_1;\theta^*) = \eta(\theta^*, \theta) \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

for any $\theta \in A^*$. Noting that $0 < q(s_i;\theta) \leq 1$ holds from condition (iii), we find that

$$-\infty < \log q(s_i;\theta) \leq 0, \quad -\infty < \sum_{s_i \in A^*} \log(q(s_i;\theta)) q(s_i;\theta) \leq 0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}_{\theta^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\theta)] &= \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}\left[\{\log q(\sigma_i;\theta) - \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\theta)]\}^2\right] \\ &= \sum_{s_i \in A^*} \left\{ \log q(s_i;\theta) - \sum_{s_i \in A^*} \log(q(s_i;\theta)) q(s_i;\theta) \right\}^2 q(s_i;\theta) \ < \ \infty\end{aligned}$$

holds. Therefore, using the strong law of large numbers from conditions (i) and (ii) and noting Equation (40), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log q(s_i;\theta) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\theta)] = \mathrm{E}_{\theta^*}\left[\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta)\right] = \eta(\theta^*,\theta) \tag{41}$$

as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ for any $\theta \in A^*$. We set

$$\delta = \min_{\theta \in A^* \setminus \{\theta^*\}} |\eta(\theta^*,\theta) - \eta(\theta^*,\theta^*)|.$$

We have $\delta > 0$ from condition (iv). Hence, for any $\theta \in A^*$ there exists $N_\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_\theta$, then

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta) - \eta(\theta^*,\theta)\right| < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

holds from Equation (41). Thus, if $n \geq N_0$ for $N_0 = \max\{N_\theta : \theta \in A^*\}$, we have

$$\max_{\theta \in A^*}\left|\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta) - \eta(\theta^*,\theta)\right| < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Therefore,

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta^*) - \eta(\theta^*,\theta^*)\right| < \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad \left|\frac{1}{n}\ell(\theta) - \eta(\theta^*,\theta)\right| < \frac{\delta}{2} \text{ for any } \theta \neq \theta^*$$

hold. From the definition of δ, the above inequalities mean that $\ell(\theta)/n$ attains a maximum value at $\theta = \theta^*$ for any $n \geq N_0$. The maximizer of $\ell(\theta)/n$ is $\breve{\theta}^{(n)}$. Hence, we obtain $\breve{\theta}^{(n)} = \theta^*$ a.s. for any $n \geq N_0$ from condition (iv). ■

We suppose that $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ has a probability function $q(s;\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with a parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in A^* \times (0,\infty)$. $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*)$ represents the true value of the parameter. $\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is defined for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}' \in A^* \times (0,\infty)$ by Equation (39). $\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \boldsymbol{\theta}')$ holds for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in A^*$. We introduce the following regular conditions, which are obtained by slightly modifying the regular conditions for

the strong consistency of maximum likelihood estimators in the case where the parameter space is $\mathbb{R}$:

1. If $|\theta_2 - \theta_2^*| > 0$, we have $\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) > 0$.

2. Setting

$$g_M(s) = \sup_{\substack{\theta_1 \neq \theta_1^* \vee \\ |\theta_2 - \theta_2^*| > M}} \log q(s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

for $M > 0$, we have

$$c_g = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[g_M(s)] < \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$$

for a sufficiently large M.

3. $q(s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is partially differentiable with respect to θ_2 for any $s \in A^*$, and setting

$$h_M(s) = \sup_{|\theta_2 - \theta_2^*| \leq M} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_2} \log q(s; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|$$

for M for which regular condition 2 holds, we have

$$c_h = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[h_M(s)] < \infty.$$

Proposition 10 *We suppose that $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, A^*)$ (i) are independent and (ii) have the identical probability function $q(s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and (iii) $q(s; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ has the support A^*. We denote the realization of σ_i by s_i for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and the maximum likelihood estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ based on $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ by $\check{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)} = (\check{\theta}_1^{(n)}, \check{\theta}_2^{(n)})$. If regular conditions 1 to 3 are satisfied, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_0$, we have $\check{\theta}_1^{(n)} = \theta_1^*$ a.s. and $\check{\theta}_2^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \theta_2^*$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. We denote the log likelihood function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ based on $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ by $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; s_1, \cdots, s_n)$. From conditions (i) and (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\left[\frac{1}{n}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right] &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\log q(\sigma_i; \boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\log q(\sigma_1; \boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in A^*} \log(q(s_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}))q(s_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

holds for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in A^* \times (0, \infty)$. We have

$$-\infty < \log q(s_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 0, \quad -\infty < \sum_{s_i \in A^*} \log(q(s_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}))q(s_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 0$$

from condition (iii). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\left[\{\log q(\sigma_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})]\}^2\right] \\ &= \sum_{s_i\in A^*}\left\{\log q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_{s_i\in A^*}\log(q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}))q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})\right\}^2 q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) \;<\; \infty\end{aligned}$$

holds. Therefore, using the strong law of large numbers from conditions (i) and (ii) and noting Equation (42), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\log q(\sigma_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\left[\frac{1}{n}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right] = \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}\in A^*\times(0,\infty)$. Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{n}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \tag{43}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$. By the definition of c_g and the strong law of large numbers, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\sup_{\substack{\theta_1\neq\theta_1^*\vee\\ |\theta_2-\theta_2^*|>M}}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n}\sup_{\substack{\theta_1\neq\theta_1^*\vee\\ |\theta_2-\theta_2^*|>M}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sup_{\substack{\theta_1\neq\theta_1^*\vee\\ |\theta_2-\theta_2^*|>M}}\log q(s_i;\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}g_M(s) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c_g\end{aligned}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$. Hence, from regular condition 2,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sup_{\substack{\theta_1\neq\theta_1^*\vee\\ |\theta_2-\theta_2^*|>M}}\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*,\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$. Thus, noting Equation (43), we observe that the maximizer of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in $A^*\times(0,\infty)$, i.e., the maximum likelihood estimate $\check{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n)}$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ satisfies

$$\check{\theta}_1^{(n)} = \theta_1^* \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\theta}_2^{(n)}\in[-M,M] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$. The almost sure convergence of $\check{\theta}_2^{(n)}$ to θ_2^* is demonstrated using regular conditions 1 and 3 in the same manner as in the proof of the strong consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator in the case where the parameter space is $\mathbb{R}$. ■

Regular conditions 1 to 3 are quite general, and $L_{A^*}(\lambda,\rho)$ satisfies these conditions as well as condition (iii) of Proposition 10.

A5 Convergence of a sequence of algorithms to an algorithm

In this subsection, we define the convergence of a sequence of algorithms to an algorithm. This concept is used in describing Theorem 3 in Section 4.

Let X and Y be input and output spaces, respectively, and d_Y be a distance function on Y. Here, as algorithms we consider a sequence of computations that returns an output $y \in Y$ for each input $x \in X$ and for which the number $\ell(x)$ of computations required to return y and the j-th computation $c_x^{(j)}$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, \ell(x)$ can vary depending on x. In other words, for a function $\ell : X \to \mathbb{Z}^+$ and computations $c_x^{(1)}, \cdots, c_x^{(\ell(x))}$ determined for each $x \in X$, we consider algorithms represented as a composition $C : X \to Y,\ x \mapsto c_x^{(\ell(x))} \circ \cdots \circ c_x^{(1)}(x)$ of these computations. Let k be a $\mathbb{Z}^+$-valued function defined on $\mathbb{Z}^+ \times X$ and $B_n = b_{n,x}^{(k(n,x))} \circ \cdots \circ b_{n,x}^{(1)}$ be an algorithm with the input and output spaces X and Y for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We consider a sequence $\{B_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ of algorithms with the parameter $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Definition 4 We say that $\{B_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ converges to C as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ if for any $x \in X$ (i) there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_0$, then $k(n,x) = \ell(x)$ holds and (ii) $d_Y(b_{n,x}^{(k(n,x))} \circ \cdots \circ b_{n,x}^{(1)}(x), c_x^{(\ell(x))} \circ \cdots \circ c_x^{(1)}(x)) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

In the case where the parameter space is $[0, \infty)$, the convergence of $\{B_n\}$ to C is defined in a similar manner. Furthermore, if X is a probability space, the convergence in probability and the almost sure convergence of $\{B_n\}$ to C are defined in a trivial manner based on Definition 4. We can also define the convergence of $\{B_n\}$ to C in a stronger manner by replacing condition (ii) in Definition 4 with (ii′) for each $j = 1, \cdots, \ell(x)$ there exists a metric space (Y_j, d_j) such that $b_{n,x}^{(j)} \circ \cdots \circ b_{n,x}^{(1)}(x), c_x^{(j)} \circ \cdots \circ c_x^{(1)}(x) \in Y_j$ holds and $d_j(b_{n,x}^{(j)} \circ \cdots \circ b_{n,x}^{(1)}(x), c_x^{(j)} \circ \cdots \circ c_x^{(1)}(x)) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

A6 Proofs of the results

In this subsection, proofs of the results described in the main text are provided.

Proof of Proposition and definition 1. The nonnegativity is trivial. Noting that there exist $|\partial U(\lambda,r)|$ strings in A^* that satisfy $r = d(s,\lambda)$ and that $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}(\rho/(\rho+1))^r = \rho+1$ holds from $\rho/(\rho+1) < 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{s\in A^*} q(s;\lambda,\rho) &= \frac{1}{\rho+1}\sum_{s\in A^*}\frac{1}{\left|\partial U(\lambda,d(s,\lambda))\right|}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)^{d(s,\lambda)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho+1}\sum_{r=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{|\partial U(\lambda,r)|}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)^{r}|\partial U(\lambda,r)| = \frac{1}{\rho+1}(\rho+1) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Lemma 1. Corollary 4.2 in [19] holds for any $d \in D$ (the proof described in [19] works for any $d \in D$). We denote the relative frequency of $x \in \bar{A}$ at the j-th site of $s_1,\cdots,s_n \in A^*$ by $f_j^{(n)}(x)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Let $m\cdot t = \{m_1,\cdots,m_{|m|},t_1,\cdots,t_\ell,e,\cdots\}$.

(Step 1) We first consider the case of $|m| \geq 1$. We set

$$x_j^* = \arg\max_{x\in A\setminus\{m_j\}} q_j(x), \quad \delta_j = q_j(m_j) - q_j(x_j^*)$$

for each $j = 1,\cdots,|m|$,

$$\delta_j = q_j(a_1) - q_j(e)$$

for each $j = |m|+1,\cdots,|m|+\ell$ if $\ell \geq 1$, and

$$x_{|m|+\ell+1}^* = \arg\max_{x\in A} q_{|m|+\ell+1}(x), \quad \delta_{|m|+\ell+1} = q_{|m|+\ell+1}(e) - q_{|m|+\ell+1}(x_{|m|+\ell+1}^*).$$

From condition (ii), $\delta_j > 0$ holds for each $j = 1,\cdots,|m|+\ell+1$. We put $\epsilon_j = \delta_j/3$. By condition (iii) and the strong law of large numbers, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_0$, we have

$$\left|f_j^{(n)}(m_j) - q_j(m_j)\right| < \epsilon_j, \quad \left|f_j^{(n)}(e) - q_j(e)\right| < \epsilon_j \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for each $j = 1,\cdots,|m|$,

$$\left|f_j^{(n)}(a_1) - q_j(a_1)\right| < \epsilon_j, \quad \left|f_j^{(n)}(e) - q_j(e)\right| < \epsilon_j \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for each $j = |m|+1,\cdots,|m|+\ell$ if $\ell \geq 1$, and

$$\left|f_{|m|+\ell+1}^{(n)}(e) - q_{|m|+\ell+1}(e)\right| < \epsilon_{|m|+\ell+1}, \quad \left|f_{|m|+\ell+1}^{(n)}(x_{|m|+\ell+1}^*) - q_{|m|+\ell+1}(x_{|m|+\ell+1}^*)\right| < \epsilon_{|m|+\ell+1} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus, noting the definition of ϵ_j, if $n \geq N_0$, then $f_j^{(n)}(m_j) > f_j^{(n)}(e)$ a.s. for each $j = 1, \cdots, |m|$, $f_j^{(n)}(a_1) > f_j^{(n)}(e)$ a.s. for each $j = |m|+1, \cdots, |m|+\ell$ if $\ell \geq 1$, and $f_{|m|+\ell+1}^{(n)}(e) > f_{|m|+\ell+1}^{(n)}(x_{|m|+\ell+1}^*)$ a.s. hold. Consequently, from Equation (2), we obtain

$$j^* = |m| + \ell \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{44}$$

for $n \geq N_0$ in both cases of $\ell = 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$.

We set $\epsilon_0 = \min_{1 \leq j \leq |m|} \epsilon_j$. By condition (iii) and the strong law of large numbers, for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_1$, then

$$\left| f_j^{(n)}(m_j) - q_j(m_j) \right| < \epsilon, \quad \left| f_j^{(n)}(x_j^*) - q_j(x_j^*) \right| < \epsilon \quad \text{a.s.}$$

hold for each $j = 1, \cdots, |m|$. Therefore, noting the definition of ϵ_0, we have

$$\left| f_j^{(n)}(m_j) - f_j^{(n)}(x_j^*) \right| > \epsilon \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{45}$$

for $n \geq N_1$. We consider the case of $\ell \geq 1$. Noting condition (ii) and using the strong law of large numbers from condition (iii), there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_2$, then

$$\max_{x \in A} f_j^{(n)}(x) - \min_{x \in A} f_j^{(n)}(x) < \epsilon \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{46}$$

holds for each $j = |m|+1, \cdots, |m|+\ell$. Hence, noting the definition of condition $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ and Equation (3), we have

$$j^{(\epsilon)} = |m| \ (\geq 1) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{47}$$

for $n \geq \max\{N_0, N_1, N_2\}$. From Equations (44) and (47), $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ is determined according to the lower of Equation (4) in the case of $\ell \geq 1$ and, from the definition of $\eta(j)$, is a sequence obtained by concatenating a substring composed of the first to the $|m|$-th letters of a consensus sequence of $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ with an infinite sequence of es. In the case of $\ell = 0$, $\mathrm{U}^{(\epsilon)}$ does not hold from Equation (45). Thus, $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ is determined according to the middle of Equation (4) and is the same sequence as in the case of $\ell \geq 1$. Therefore, noting conditions (iii) and (iv) and

applying Corollary 4.2 in [19] to only the substring composed of the first to the $|m|$-th letters of $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$, if $n \geq \max\{N_0, N_1, N_2\}$, then

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \{m_1, \cdots, m_{|m|}, e, \cdots\} = m \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{48}$$

holds.

(Step 2) We next consider the case of $|m| = 0$. We set

$$x_j^* = \arg\max_{x \in A} q_j(x), \quad \delta_j = q_j(e) - q_j(x_j^*), \quad \epsilon_j = \frac{\delta_j}{3}$$

for each $j \geq \ell + 1$ and put $\epsilon_0 = \min_{j \geq \ell+1} \epsilon_j$. Conducting a similar discussion to that in Step 1 noting condition (ii) and using the strong law of large numbers from condition (iii), there exists $N_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_3$, then $f_j^{(n)}(e) > f_j^{(n)}(x_j^*)$ a.s. holds for each $j \geq \ell + 1$. Consequently, in the case of $\ell = 0$, we have $j^* = 0$ a.s. for $n \geq N_3$ from Equation (2). On the other hand, in the case of $\ell \geq 1$, $j^* \geq 1$ a.s. holds. Furthermore, conducting a similar discussion to that in Step 1, for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there exists $N_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_4$, Equation (46) holds for each $j = 1, \cdots, \ell$. Hence, we have $j^{(\epsilon)} = 0$ a.s. for $n \geq \max\{N_3, N_4\}$. Thus, in both cases of $\ell = 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$, $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ is determined according to the upper of Equation (4), and if $n \geq \max\{N_3, N_4\}$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = o = m \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{49}$$

holds. Combining Equations (48) and (49) completes the proof. ■

Proof of Proposition 1. Obvious from Lemma 1, Proposition 5, and Lemma 3. ■

Proof of Proposition 2. We demonstrate Part (b). Condition (iv) of Lemma 1 is satisfied from condition (i). Thus, noting conditions (ii′) and (iii′) and using Proposition 1, there exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n \geq N_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have $\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \lambda$ a.s., and therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{50}$$

From conditions (ii′) and (iii′), $d_{H'}(s_1, \lambda), \cdots, d_{H'}(s_n, \lambda)$ are also independent. Using Proposition 7 from conditions (i) and (ii′), we have $\mathrm{E}_{\lambda,\rho}[d_{H'}(\sigma_i, \lambda)] = \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_m(\sigma_i) = \rho$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Further-

more,

$$\mathrm{E}_{\lambda,\rho}\left[\left\{d_{H'}(\sigma_i,\lambda)-\mathrm{E}_{\lambda,\rho}[d_{H'}(\sigma_i,\lambda)]\right\}^2\right]=\sum_{s\in A^*}\{d_{H'}(s,\lambda)-\rho\}^2 q(s;\lambda,\rho)<\infty$$

holds. Hence, by the strong law of large numbers, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i,\lambda)\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{E}_{\lambda,\rho}[d_{H'}(\sigma_i,\lambda)]=\rho \tag{51}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$. Combining Equations (50) and (51) provides $\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i,\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1,\cdots,s_n))/n\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\rho$ as $n\longrightarrow\infty$ and $\epsilon\longrightarrow 0$. Part (a) is demonstrated in a similar manner. ■

Proof of Proposition 3. We suppose that n strings $s_1,\cdots,s_n$ are observed and set $r_i=d(s_i,\lambda)$ for each $i=1,\cdots,n$. The log likelihood function of λ and ρ is given by

$$\ell(\lambda,\rho;s_1,\cdots,s_n)=-n\log(\rho+1)-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\left|\partial U(\lambda,d(s_i,\lambda))\right|+\log\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda).$$

Solving

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\ell(\lambda,\rho;s_1,\cdots,s_n)=-\frac{n}{\rho+1}+\frac{1}{\rho(\rho+1)}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda)=0$$

with respect to ρ, we obtain

$$\rho^*=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda).$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\rho^2}\ell(\lambda,\rho;s_1,\cdots,s_n)=\frac{n\rho^2-2R\rho-R}{\rho^2(\rho+1)^2}$$

for $R=\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda)$. Noting

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\rho^2}\ell(\lambda,\rho;s_1,\cdots,s_n)<0\Longleftrightarrow\frac{R}{n}-\frac{\sqrt{R(R+n)}}{n}<\rho<\frac{R}{n}+\frac{\sqrt{R(R+n)}}{n},$$

$\partial^2\ell(\lambda,\rho^*;s_1,\cdots,s_n)/\partial\rho^2<0$ holds. Therefore, if λ is known, the maximum likelihood estimator of ρ is given by

$$\check{\rho}(s_1,\cdots,s_n)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(s_i,\lambda).$$

If λ is unknown, the maximum likelihood estimator of ρ is obtained by replacing λ on the right-hand side of the above equation with its maximum likelihood estimator. ■

Proof of Theorem 1. Conditions (i) and (ii) imply conditions (iii) and (iv) of Lemma 1, respectively. Therefore, applying Proposition 1 from condition (iii), there exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n \geq N_0$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \lambda \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{52}$$

holds. Because the Laplace-like distribution satisfies the conditions of Proposition 10, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n \geq N_1$, we have

$$\check{\lambda}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \lambda \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{53}$$

Combining Equations (52) and (53) provides $\check{\lambda}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ a.s. for any $n \geq \max\{N_0, N_1\}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\check{\rho}(s_1, \cdots, s_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{H'}(s_i, \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_1, \cdots, s_n)) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for any $n \geq \max\{N_0, N_1\}$ from Proposition 3. ■

Proof of Lemma 2. Examining the process of deriving an EM algorithm for a mixture model (see, for example, [31]), we observe that Equations (8) and (9) that provide the formulae for updating $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\pi}_g^{(t)}$, respectively, are common to all distributions on all spaces. The object function of the maximization in the M step of the EM algorithm is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{g=1}^{k} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} \left\{ -\log(\rho_g + 1) - \log \left| \partial U(\lambda_g, d(s_i, \lambda_g)) \right| + d(s_i, \lambda_g) \log \left(\frac{\rho_g}{\rho_g + 1} \right) \right\}. \tag{54}$$

Because the order of the summations with respect to i and g can be interchanged, seeking $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k$ that maximize Equation (54) is equivalent to seeking λ_g that maximizes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} \left\{ -\log \left| \partial U(\lambda_g, d(s_i, \lambda_g)) \right| + d(s_i, \lambda_g) \log \left(\frac{\rho_g}{\rho_g + 1} \right) \right\}$$

for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$, noting $-\log |\partial U(\lambda_g, d(s_i, \lambda_g))| \leq 0$ and $\log(\rho_g/(\rho_g + 1)) < 0$. Therefore, Equation (10) provides a procedure for updating an estimate of λ_g if the maximization problem can be

solved when the distance d is specified. For each $g = 1, \cdots, k$, partially differentiating Equation (54) with respect to ρ_g leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_g} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{g'=1}^{k} \hat{\zeta}_{ig'}^{(t)} \left\{ -\log(\rho_{g'} + 1) - \log \left| \partial U(\lambda_{g'}, d(s_i, \lambda_{g'})) \right| + d(s_i, \lambda_{g'}) \log \left(\frac{\rho_{g'}}{\rho_{g'} + 1} \right) \right\} \\
= \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} \left(-\frac{1}{\rho_g + 1} + \frac{d(s_i, \lambda_g)}{\rho_g} - \frac{d(s_i, \lambda_g)}{\rho_g + 1} \right) = \frac{1}{\rho_g(\rho_g + 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} d(s_i, \lambda_g) - \frac{\rho_g}{\rho_g(\rho_g + 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, solving the equation

$$\frac{1}{\rho_g(\rho_g + 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} d(s_i, \lambda_g) - \frac{\rho_g}{\rho_g(\rho_g + 1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} = 0$$

with respect to ρ_g, we obtain

$$\rho_g = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(t)} d(s_i, \lambda_g).$$

Hence, Equation (11) provides a procedure for updating an estimate of ρ_g. ■

Proof of Proposition 4. The topology on A^* is a discrete topology for any $d \in D$ (see the second paragraph of Section 2). Thus, from Equations (1) and (8), $\hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t)}$ is a continuous function of $\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t)}, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t)}$, and $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t)}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $g = 1, \cdots, k$. Hence, Part (a) is obvious. Therefore, we demonstrate Part (b).

(Step 1) From the independence of $\boldsymbol{Z}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{Z}_n$, $Z_{1g}, \cdots, Z_{ng}$, and consequently $\zeta_{1g}, \cdots, \zeta_{ng}$, are also independent for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$. Moreover, we have $\mathrm{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\zeta_{ig}^*] = \pi_g^*$ and

$$\mathrm{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}[\zeta_{ig}^*] = \sum_{(s_1, \cdots, s_n) \in (A^*)^n} (\zeta_{ig}^* - \pi_g^*)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{q}(s_i; \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) < \infty$$

for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $g = 1, \cdots, k$. Thus, using the strong law of large numbers provides

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_{ig}^* \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi_g^* \tag{55}$$

as $n_g \longrightarrow \infty$. Hence, from the condition of Part (b) and Equation (9), we obtain $\hat{\pi}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi_g^*$ as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow \infty$.

(Step 2) Noting that $Z_{1g}, \cdots, Z_{ng}$ are independent and that $\mathrm{E}_{\pi_g^*}[Z_{ig}] = \pi_g^*$ and $\mathrm{Var}_{\pi_g^*}[Z_{ig}] < \infty$ hold from Equation (6) and applying the strong law of large numbers, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig}/n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi_g^*$

as $n_g \longrightarrow \infty$. Therefore, from Equation (55),

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_{ig}^{*} \tag{56}$$

holds as $n_g \longrightarrow \infty$. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\{i'\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:x_{i'j}=a_h\}} z_{ig} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\{i'\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:x_{i'j}=a_h\}} \zeta_{ig}^{*} \tag{57}$$

as $n_g \longrightarrow \infty$ in the same manner. Combining Equations (56) and (57) with the condition of Part (b) gives

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig}, \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\{i'\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:x_{i'j}=a_h\}} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in\{i'\in\{1,\cdots,n\}:x_{i'j}=a_h\}} z_{ig} \tag{58}$$

as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Thus, from Equation (12), we obtain $\varphi_{gjh} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} f_{gjh}$ as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Hence, using Equations (4) and (13), there exist $N_0, T_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_0, t \geq T_0$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then

$$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} = \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{59}$$

Applying Proposition 1 to $\sigma_{g1}, \cdots, \sigma_{gn_g}$, there exist $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_1$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) = \lambda_g^{*} \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{60}$$

Noting Equations (59) and (60), we see that there exist $N_2, T_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_2, t \geq T_2$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, then $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} = \lambda_g^{*}$ a.s. holds.

(Step 3) From Equation (56), we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig} d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g^{*}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta_{ig}^{*} d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g^{*})$$

as $n_g \longrightarrow \infty$. Thus, from the condition of Part (b),

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t)} d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g^{*}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig} d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g^{*}) \tag{61}$$

holds as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Using the left of Equation (58) and Equation (61), we have

$$\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)} d_{H'}(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig}} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig} d_{H'}(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \tag{62}$$

as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow \infty$. Noting the result of Step 2 and applying Proposition 2 to $\sigma_{g1}, \cdots, \sigma_{gn_g}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig}} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig} d_{H'}(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n_g} \sum_{i=1}^{n_g} d_{H'}(s_{gi}, \lambda_g^*) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho_g^* \tag{63}$$

as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. From Equations (62) and (63), $\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \rho_g^*$ holds as $n_g, t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow \infty$. Combining the results of Steps 1 to 3 completes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. (Step 1) Let $\check{\lambda}_g^{(n_g)}$ and $\check{\rho}_g^{(n_g)}$ represent the maximum likelihood estimators of λ_g and ρ_g based on $s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}$, respectively, for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$. Applying Theorem 1 to $\sigma_{g1}, \cdots, \sigma_{gn_g}$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n^* \geq N_0$, then $\check{\lambda}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\lambda}_k^{(n_k)}, \check{\rho}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\rho}_k^{(n_k)}$ are uniquely determined with probability one. Therefore, if $n^* \geq N_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig} \log q(s_i; \lambda_g, \rho_g) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ig} \log q(s_i; \check{\lambda}_g^{(n_g)}, \check{\rho}_g^{(n_g)}) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{64}$$

for any $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k, \rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k) \in (A^*)^k \times (0, \infty)^k \setminus \{(\check{\lambda}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\lambda}_k^{(n_k)}, \check{\rho}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\rho}_k^{(n_k)})\}$. By Proposition 10, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n^* \geq N_1$, then

$$(\check{\lambda}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\lambda}_k^{(n_k)}) = (\lambda_1^*, \cdots, \lambda_k^*) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{65}$$

and

$$(\check{\rho}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\rho}_k^{(n_k)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\rho_1^*, \cdots, \rho_k^*) \tag{66}$$

as $n^* \longrightarrow \infty$.

(Step 2) Let $\tilde{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \tilde{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}$ be estimates of ζ_{ig}, λ_g, and ρ_g obtained at iteration step t from the initial value $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0)}$ using Algorithm H', respectively. Noting condition (i) and using Equations (65) and (66), there exist $N_2, T_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n^* \geq N_2, t \geq T_2$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then

$$(\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \tilde{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) = (\check{\lambda}_1^{(n_1)}, \cdots, \check{\lambda}_k^{(n_k)}) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{67}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\check{\rho}_1^{(n_1)},\cdots,\check{\rho}_k^{(n_k)}) \tag{68}$$

as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Applying Part (a) of Proposition 4 from condition (i), we have

$$(\tilde{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^*,\cdots,\zeta_{nk}^*) \tag{69}$$

as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}\log q(s_i;\tilde{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\tilde{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}z_{ig}\log q(s_i;\tilde{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\tilde{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \tag{70}$$

as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ in a similar manner to deriving Equation (61). Combining Equations (64), (67), (68), and (70) provides

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}z_{ig}\log q(s_i;\lambda_g,\rho_g) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{g=1}^{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}\log q(s_i;\tilde{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\tilde{\rho}_g^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{71}$$

for any $(\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k) \in (A^*)^k \times (0,\infty)^k \setminus \{(\check{\lambda}_1^{(n_1)},\cdots,\check{\lambda}_k^{(n_k)},\check{\rho}_1^{(n_1)},\cdots,\check{\rho}_k^{(n_k)})\}$ as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. From Equations (64) and (71) and condition C_1, there exist $N_3,T_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $n^* \geq N_3, t \geq T_3$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then

$$(\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) = (\lambda_1^\dagger,\cdots,\lambda_k^\dagger) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{72}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^\dagger,\cdots,\zeta_{nk}^\dagger), \quad (\tilde{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\rho_1^\dagger,\cdots,\rho_k^\dagger) \tag{73}$$

as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. In other words, combined with condition C_1 and Proposition 10, condition (i) means that there exists an initial value $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0)}$ with which Algorithm H' returns a sequence $\{\tilde{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\tilde{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)},\cdots,\tilde{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}\}$ of estimates that almost surely converges to the maximizer $(\zeta_{11}^\dagger,\cdots,\zeta_{nk}^\dagger,\lambda_1^\dagger,\cdots,\lambda_k^\dagger,\rho_1^\dagger,\cdots,\rho_k^\dagger)$ of Equation (14) as $n^*,t \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.

(Step 3) $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ is an initial value with which Algorithm H' returns estimates of $\zeta_{11},\cdots,\zeta_{nk}$, $\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_k,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k$ that maximize Equation (14) in a set of their estimates at iteration step τ for

all possible initial values. Therefore, from the result of Step 2, there exist $N_4, T_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that if $n^* \geq N_4, t, \tau \geq T_4$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, then

$$(\hat{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) = (\lambda_1^\dagger, \cdots, \lambda_k^\dagger) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{74}$$

and

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^\dagger, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^\dagger), \quad (\hat{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\rho_1^\dagger, \cdots, \rho_k^\dagger) \tag{75}$$

as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Noting condition C_2 and combining Equations (72) to (75), there exist $N_5, T_5 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_3 > 0$ such that if $n^* \geq N_5, t, \tau \geq T_5$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$, then

$$(\hat{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) = (\tilde{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \tilde{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{76}$$

and

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\tilde{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \tilde{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\epsilon)}), \quad (\hat{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\tilde{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \tilde{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\epsilon)}) \tag{77}$$

as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. By Equation (76), the right of Equation (77), and condition (i), $(\hat{\lambda}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \hat{\rho}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)})$ strongly consistently estimates $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k, \rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k)$ as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Combining Equation (69) and the left of Equation (77) provides

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^*, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^*)$$

as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Hence, using Part (b) of Proposition 4, we see that $(\hat{\pi}_1^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\pi}_k^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)})$ strongly consistently estimates $(\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_k)$ as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. Algorithm H' forms a sequence of algorithms with respect to the three parameters n^*, τ, and ϵ in this theorem, whereas a sequence of algorithms has one parameter n in Definition 4. It suffices to demonstrate that there exist $N_0, T_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_0, t, \tau \geq T_0$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}$ is equal to the maximizer of Equation (10) with $d = d_{H'}$ with probability one for each $g = 1, \cdots, k$.

(Step 1) Under the conditions of Theorem 2, the estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}$ at iteration step t from Algorithm H' with the initial value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(n,0,\tau,\epsilon)}$ that satisfies Equation (14) almost surely converges to the

true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ of the parameter as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Therefore, using Part (a) of Proposition 4, we have

$$(\hat{\zeta}_{11}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, \cdots, \hat{\zeta}_{nk}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} (\zeta_{11}^*, \cdots, \zeta_{nk}^*)$$

as $n^*, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)} \left\{ -\log\left|\partial U(\lambda_g, d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g))\right| + d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g) \log\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)} + 1} \right) \right\} \\
\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \quad & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{ig} \left\{ -\log\left|\partial U(\lambda_g, d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g))\right| + d_{H'}(s_i, \lambda_g) \log\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)} + 1} \right) \right\} \qquad (78) \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_g} \left\{ -\log\left|\partial U(\lambda_g, d_{H'}(s_{gi}, \lambda_g))\right| + d_{H'}(s_{gi}, \lambda_g) \log\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)} + 1} \right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

as $n_g, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ in a similar manner to obtaining Equation (61). In other words, the object function (10) of the maximization almost surely converges to the log likelihood function of λ_g based on $s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}$.

(Step 2) Let $\check{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g})$ denote the maximizer of the right-hand side of Equation (78), i.e., the maximum likelihood estimate of λ_g based on $s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}$. By Proposition 10, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that if $n_g \geq N_1$, then

$$\check{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) = \lambda_g^* \quad \text{a.s.}$$

holds, and therefore $\check{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g})$ is uniquely determined with probability one. Applying Theorem 1 to $\sigma_{g1}, \cdots, \sigma_{gn_g}$, there exist $N_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_2$ and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) = \check{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) \quad \text{a.s.} \qquad (79)$$

We observe that there exist $N_3, T_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_3 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_3, t, \tau \geq T_3$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$, then

$$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)} = \boldsymbol{m}_c^{(\epsilon)}(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) \quad \text{a.s.} \qquad (80)$$

holds in the same manner as obtaining Equation (59). Combining Equations (79) and (80), there exist $N_4, T_4 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_4 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_4, t, \tau \geq T_4$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_4$, we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)} = \check{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g}) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus, supposing that there exists $\tilde{\lambda}_g \in A^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)} \left\{ -\log\left|\partial U(\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}, d_{H'}(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}))\right| + d_{H'}(s_i, \hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}) \log\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)} + 1} \right) \right\} \\ < & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\zeta}_{ig}^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)} \left\{ -\log\left|\partial U(\tilde{\lambda}_g, d_{H'}(s_i, \tilde{\lambda}_g))\right| + d_{H'}(s_i, \tilde{\lambda}_g) \log\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)}}{\hat{\rho}_g^{(n,t-1,\tau,\epsilon)} + 1} \right) \right\} \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

holds as $n_g, t, \tau \longrightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \longrightarrow \infty$ leads to a contradiction with Equation (78) because $\breve{\lambda}_g(s_{g1}, \cdots, s_{gn_g})$ is the unique maximizer of the right-hand side of Equation (78) for $n_g \geq N_1$ with probability one. Hence, there exist $N_5, T_5 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\epsilon_5 > 0$ such that if $n_g \geq N_5, t, \tau \geq T_5$, and $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_5$, then $\hat{\lambda}_g^{(n,t,\tau,\epsilon)}$ is equal to the maximizer of the left-hand side of Equation (78) with probability one. This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Corollary 1. Obvious from the manner of constructing the clustering procedure and Theorem 2. ■

References

[1] M. A. Aizerman, E. M. Braverman, and L. I. Rozoner. Theoretical foundations of the potential function method in pattern recognition learning. *Autom. Remote Control*, 25:821–837, 1964.

[2] L. Bergroth, H. Hakonen, and T. Raita. A survey of longest common subsequence algorithms. In *String Processing and Information Retrieval (spire 2000): 7th International Symposium*, pages 39–48. IEEE, 2000.

[3] B. E. Boser, I. M. Guyon, and V. N. Vapnik. A training algorithm for optimal margin classifiers. In D. Houssler, editor, *Proc. 5th Annu. Workshop Comput. Learn. Theory*, pages 144–152, 1992.

[4] B. M. Brown. Statistical uses of the spatial median. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 45:25–30, 1983.

[5] C. Cortes and V. N. Vapnik. Support-vector networks. *Mach. Learn.*, 20(3):273–297, 1995.

[6] F. J. Damerau. A technique for computer detection and correction of spelling errors. *Commun. ACM*, 7(3):171–176, 1964.

[7] C. de la Higuera and F. Casacuberta. Topology of strings: Median string is NP-complete. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 230(1):39–48, 2000.

[8] A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 39(1):1–38, 1977.

[9] D. L. Donoho and M. Gasko. Breakdown properties of location estimates based on halfspace depth and projected outlyingness. *Ann. Stat.*, 20(4):1803–1827, 1992.

[10] H. Drucker, C. J. C. Burges, L. Kaufman, A. Smola, and V. Vapnik. Support vector regression machines. In M. C. Mozer, M. I. Jordan, and T. Petsche, editors, *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. 9*, pages 155–161. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997.

[11] R. W. Hamming. Error detecting and error correcting codes. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 29(2):147–160, 1950.

[12] D. Haussler. Convolution kernels on discrete structures. Technical Report UCSC-CRL-99-10, Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA, 1999.

[13] M. A. Jaro. Advances in record-linkage methodology as applied to matching the 1985 census of Tampa, Florida. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 84(406):414–420, 1989.

[14] X. Jiang, K. Abegglen, H. Bunke, and J. Csirik. Dynamic computation of generalised median strings. *Pattern Anal. Applic.*, 6(3):185–193, 2003.

[15] X. Jiang, J. Wentker, and M. Ferrer. Generalized median string computation by means of string embedding in vector spaces. *Pattern Recogn. Lett.*, 33(7):842–852, 2012.

[16] A. M. Kagan, C. R. Rao, and Y. V. Linnik. *Characterization Problems in Mathematical Statistics*. Wiley, New York, 1973.

[17] T. Kohonen. Median strings. *Pattern Recogn. Lett.*, 3(5):309–313, 1985.

[18] S. Kotz, T. Kozubowski, and K. Podgorski. *The Laplace Distribution and Generalizations: A Revisit With Applications to Communications, Exonomics, Engineering, and Finance*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001.

[19] H. Koyano, M. Hayashida, and T. Akutsu. Maximum margin classifier working in a set of strings. arXiv:1406.0597.

[20] H. Koyano and H. Kishino. Quantifying biodiversity and asymptotics for a sequence of random strings. *Phys. Rev. E*, 81(6):061912, 2010.

[21] H. Koyano, T. Tsubouchi, H. Kishino, and T. Akutsu. Archaeal β diversity patterns under the seafloor along geochemical gradients. *J. Geophys. Res. G*, 119(9):1770–1788, 2014.

[22] P.-S. Laplace. Mémoire sur la probabilité des causes par les evenements. *Mémoires de l'Academie Royale des Sciences Presentés par Divers Savants*, 6:621–656, 1774.

[23] C. Leslie, E. Eskin, J. Weston, and W. S. Noble. Mismatch string kernels for SVM protein classification. In S. Becker, S. Thrun, and K. Obermayer, editors, *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. 15*, pages 1417–1424. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003.

[24] C. Leslie and R. Kuang. Fast string kernels using inexact matching for protein sequences. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 5:1435–1455, 2004.

[25] C. S. Leslie, E. Eskin, and W. S. Noble. The spectrum kernel: A string kernel for SVM protein classification. In R. B. Altman, A. K. Dunker, L. Hunter, T. E. Klein, and K. Lauderdale, editors, *Proc. Pacific Symp. Biocomput.*, volume 7, pages 566–575, 2002.

[26] V. I. Levenshtein. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions and reversals. *Doklady Adademii Nauk SSSR*, 163(4):845–848, 1965.

[27] H. Li and T. Jiang. A class of edit kernels for SVMs to predict translation initiation sites in eukaryotic mRNAs. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 12(6):702–718, 2005.

[28] H. Lodhi, J. Shawe-Taylor, N. Cristianini, and C. Watkins. Text classication using string kernel. In T. K. Leen, T. G. Dietterich, and V. Tresp, editors, *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. 13*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2001.

[29] C. D. Martínez-Hinarejos, A. Juan, and F. Casacuberta. Use of median string for classification. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Pattern Recognition, 2000*, volume 2, pages 903–906. IEEE, 2000.

[30] C. D. Martınez-Hinarejos, A. Juan, and F. Casacuberta. Median strings for *k*-nearest neighbour classification. *Pattern Recogn. Lett.*, 24(1):173–181, 2003.

[31] G. McLachlan and T. Krishnan. *The EM Algorithm and Extensions*. Wiley, New York, 1997.

[32] G. McLachlan and D. Peel. *Finite Mixture Models*. Wiley, New York, 2004.

[33] G. Navarro. A guided tour to approximate string matching. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 33(1):31–88, 2001.

[34] F. Nicolas and E. Rivals. Complexities of the centre and median string problems. In R. Baeza-Yates, E. Chávez, and M. Crochemore, editors, *Combinatorial Pattern Matching*, pages 315–327. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[35] F. Nicolas and E. Rivals. Hardness results for the center and median string problems under the weighted and unweighted edit distances. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 3(2):390–415, 2005.

[36] H. Oja. Descriptive statistics for multivariate distributions. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 1(6):327–332, 1983.

[37] H. Oja and A. Niinimaa. Asymptotic properties of the generalized median in the case of multivariate normality. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 47:372–377, 1985.

[38] C. Olivares-Rodríguez and J. Oncina. A stochastic approach to median string computation. In N. da Vitoria Lobo, T. Kasparis, J. T. Roli, F. Kwok, M. Georgiopoulos, G. C. Anagnostopoulos, and M. Loog, editors, *Structural, Syntactic, and Statistical Pattern Recognition*, pages 431–440. Springer, Berlin, 2008.

[39] G. Paaß, E. Leopold, M. Larson, J Kindermann, and S. Eickeler. SVM classification using sequences of phonemes and syllables. In T. Elomaa, H. Mannila, and H. Toivonen, editors, *Proc. 6th Eur. Conf. Principles Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, pages 373–384. Springer, 2002.

[40] K. Pearson. Contributions to the Mathematical Theory of Evolutilon. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 185:71–110, 1894.

[41] M. D. Perlman. On the strong consistency of approximate maximum likelihood estimators. In L. M. Le Cam, J. Neyman, and E. L. Scott, editors, *Proc. 6th Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. Prob.*, volume 1, pages 263–281, Berkeley, CA, 1972. University of California Press.

[42] H. Saigo, J.-P. Vert, N. Ueda, and T. Akutsu. Protein homology detection using string alignment kernels. *Bioinformatics*, 20(11):1682–1689, 2004.

[43] J. W. Tukey. Mathematics and the picturing of data. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vancouver, 1974*, volume 2, pages 523–531, 1975.

[44] V. N. Vapnik. *Statistical Learning Theory*. Wiley, 1998.

[45] J.-P. Vert. Support vector machine prediction of signal peptide cleavage site using a new class of kernels for strings. In R. B. Altman, A. K. Dunker, L. Hunter, T. E. Klein, and K. Lauderdale, editors, *Proc. Pacific Symp. Biocomput.*, volume 7, pages 649–660, 2002.

[46] S. V. N. Vishwanathan and A. J. Smola. Fast kernels for string and tree matching. In K. Tsuda, B. Schölkopf, and J.-P. Vert, editors, *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*, pages 113–130. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2004.

[47] A. Wald. Note on the consistency of the maximum likelihood estimate. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 29:595–601, 1949.

[48] M. S. Waterman. *Introduction to Computational Biology: Maps, Sequences and Genomes*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1995.

[49] C. Watkins. Dynamic alignment kernels. Technical Report CSD-TR-98-11, Computer Science Department, University of London, Royal Holloway, 1999.

[50] W. E. Winkler. String comparator metrics and enhanced decision rules in the Fellegi–Sunter model of record linkage. In *Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods*, pages 354–359. American Statistical Association, 1990.

[51] A. Zien, G. Rätsch, S. Mika, B. Schölkopf, T. Lengauer, and K.-R. Müller. Engineering support vector machine kernels that recognize translation initiation sites. *Bioinformatics*, 16(9):799–807, 2000.